

# CHURCH HISTORY

Edited By J. H. NICHOLS and WILHELM PAUCK  
*University of Chicago*  
with the cooperation of

ROLAND BAINTON (*Divinity School,  
Yale University*)

R. PIERCE BEAVER (*Missionary Re-  
search Library*)

ROBERT GRANT (*Divinity School,  
University of Chicago*)

WINTHROP S. HUDSON (*Colgate-  
Rochester Divinity School*)

SIDNEY E. MEAD (*Divinity School,  
University of Chicago*)

RAY C. PETRY (*Divinity School, Duke  
University*)

MATTHEW SPINKA (*Hartford Theo-  
logical Seminary*)

L. J. TRINTERUD (*McCormick Theo-  
logical Seminary*)

---

Vol. XXII

March, 1953

No. 1

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### THE AUTHENTICITY OF HOOKER'S BOOK VII

*H. F. Woodhouse*

3

### THE PROTESTANT QUEST FOR A CHRISTIAN AMERICA

*Robert T. Handy*

8

### THE POLITICAL IMPACT ON RELIGIOUS DEVELOPMENT IN URUGUAY

*Russell H. Fitzgibbon*

21

### PROF. SWEET'S RELIGION AND CULTURE IN AMERICA

*Sidney E. Mead*

33

### MINUTES OF THE SOCIETY AND COUNCIL

71

### AN INVENTORY OF CURRENT RESEARCH IN MISSIONS

IN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA ..... *R. Pierce Beaver* 50

## CONTENTS

### BOOK REVIEWS:

- HARDY, E. R.: *Christian Egypt* ..... Georges Florovsky
- TALBOT, D. A.: *Contemporary Ethiopia*
- TRIMMINGHAM, J. S.: *Islam in Ethiopia* ..... Joseph M. Kitagawa
- OUTERBRIDGE, L. M.: *The Lost Churches of China* ..... K. S. Latourette
- BOARDMAN, E. P.: *Christian Influence Upon . . . the  
Taiping Rebellion* ..... Joseph M. Kitagawa
- STUERMANN, W. E.: *Calvin's Concept of Faith* ..... Paul T. Fuhrman
- DU VAIR, (ed. by R. KIRK): *Moral Philosophie of the  
Stoicks* ..... Quirinus Breen
- CNATTINGIUS, H.: *Bishops and Societies* ..... Joseph M. Kitagawa
- FOX, GEORGE, (ed by J. L. NICKALLS): *Journal* ..... Winthrop S. Hudson
- MANNING, B. L., (ed by O. GREENWOOD): *The Protestant  
Dissenting Deputies* ..... Winthrop S. Hudson
- SMITH, E. W.: *Life and Times of Daniel Lindley  
(1801-1880)* ..... R. Pierce Beaver
- DRUMMOND, A. L.: *The Churches in English  
Fiction* ..... Robert Hastings Nichols
- HOPKINS, C. HOWARD: *History of the Y. M. C. A. in  
North America* ..... W. W. Sweet
- RICHARDS, G.: *History of the Reformed Church  
Seminary* ..... Raymond W. Albright
- RUPP, G.: *Principalities and Powers* ..... Robert H. Fischer
- OWEN, D. R. G.: *Scientism, Man, and Religion* ..... James Luther Adams
- MCCONNELL, F. J.: *By the Way* ..... A. W. Nagler

## THE AUTHENTICITY OF HOOKER'S BOOK VII

H. F. WOODHOUSE

*Wycliffe College*

This year marks the fourth centenary of Richard Hooker, who is perhaps the greatest apologist of the Anglican Church. It is easy to forget this because the epithet "judicious" when used of him conveys to most of us the idea of one who was careful, conscientious and not likely to accept or adopt rash views. But the meaning of the word "judicious" as applied to Hooker is "judicial." It was used of one who had spoken the last word on a subject, one whose conclusions and opinion were so firmly based that neither premise nor conclusions could be shaken.

Consequently the views of Hooker upon the topics treated in the *Ecclesiastical Polity* become very important. But in the case of the last three books complications arise concerning their genuineness and authenticity. This article is an attempt to state the present position and perhaps open the way to further discussion, though whether a final solution can be found may well be regarded as very doubtful.

This article deals with book VII, its provenance and genuineness. The subject is important because Hooker's doctrine of the Church is incomplete unless the material contained in Book VII is included. Furthermore, as has been familiar to students since Keble published his "Introduction" to Hooker's *Works*, Hooker did not take what seemed to be the easier and most effective line against the Puritans in their attack upon the Anglican Church. This was to assert that the Anglican polity possessed an "exclusive apostolical prerogative." The obvious reason why he did not is because he did not feel convinced of its truth.

In view of these facts the ensuing article is not merely a discussion of minutiae but the spade work which must be undertaken in view of the nature and importance of book VII and of Hooker's place in Anglican apologetics.

There has been no contribution of importance to the discussion of this question known to the author since Canon Shirley of Canterbury published his book *Richard Hooker and Contemporary Political Ideas* in 1949.

On this point it has frequently been shown that there seems to be a clash of opinion between books III and V and book VII. If book VII is not accepted as genuine Hooker, whether in whole or in part, it will certainly leave Hooker's opinions in the earlier books as the only reliable expression of his views, and for this reason an attempt to evaluate Canon Shirley's position may have some value.

In his "Preface" the Canon stated "I cannot accept the Seventh book as genuine Hooker, though doubtless much of it is." Reviewers seemed to accept his detailed discussion about this book (pp. 41-57) without great demur, and this acceptance could have an important bearing upon Hooker's views concerning episcopacy.

Canon Shirley's case appears very reasonable but there are several flaws in it, flaws which, to my knowledge, have not been exposed to date. Firstly, he does not refer to an exhaustive discussion by R. A. Houk entitled *Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity Book VIII* (New York 1931), though he has used Prof. Sisson's book, *The Judicious Marriage of Mr. Hooker*, and the latter refers to Houk. Secondly, many of his arguments are questions of style, and thirdly, he seems in certain cases to omit other explanations of details or to lay excessive weight on certain arguments. These statements must be amplified and proven but they are set down here in the belief that the last word has not yet been said and in the hope of stimulating further discussion.

The trouble concerning book VII starts with the fact that it did not appear in print till 1662, almost two generations after the author's death and fourteen years after books VI and VIII. So it is asked: were the books finished at all when Hooker died or were they tampered with later, and if so, by whom? The answer to these questions are doubtful and we have to depend on internal evidence in deciding whether they are genuine.

In the interval of some sixty years between Hooker's death and their publication they could have been tampered with either by Puritans or High Anglicans. Canon Shirley examines possibilities in detail and in company with Coleridge and Hallam, inclines to the latter idea.

Turning to the more recent work of Dr. Houk and Prof. Sisson on this subject we find the former concluding that the three books are authentic. "There was neither forgery nor interpolation," nor were the manuscripts corrupted. Houk thinks that all three are genuine documents of 1593, even if unfinished.<sup>1</sup>

Sisson's conclusions are that the story of the completion and the destruction of the copy for the last three books is without foundation. He accepts the Seventh book as genuine, and on the topic of episcopacy says "there is nothing in Hooker to serve as a foundation for an episcopacy by apostolic succession and divine institution."<sup>2</sup>

It is time that we weighed Canon Shirley's arguments. He points out that book VII (edited by Gauden) appeared like a bolt from the blue in 1662, when Gauden himself, in 1659, said it had disappeared. Like Keble, he refers to the lack of any explanation as to how Gauden got it and from one of Gauden's own sentences he suggests that Gauden may have tried to counterfeit Hooker's style, method and



notions.<sup>3</sup> He develops at length the less reputable incidents in Gauden's character, the trend of his writings, noting his ability to "serve both the Lord and the times," and showing that Bishop Wadsworth proved him untrustworthy.<sup>4</sup> Canon Shirley asks why Laud did not use the manuscripts and thinks perhaps Peters may have given them to Gauden.

These points build up quite a formidable case and form one main line of Canon Shirley's reasoning, but they are not unanswerable or incapable of partial and perhaps full explanation.

One can agree with Canon Shirley that it is a serious matter that Gauden did not give a better account of the provenance of book VII because it suggests that he could not do so. But Canon Shirley's next point cannot bear much weight, namely, that because Gauden spoke of the difficulty of counterfeiting Hooker he had tried to do so. Gauden's sentence is capable of several interpretations. Gauden's own character is the most serious argument and certainly justifies Paget's description of him as "an untrustworthy witness."<sup>5</sup>

Laud is supposed not to have utilised book VII to support his prelati cal pretensions and Canon Shirley uses this point, but would book VII have greatly helped Laud? The answer to the question appears to be in the negative except in a limited number of passages and in these cases we must ask what Hooker's conception of episcopacy was.<sup>6</sup>

Canon Shirley supports these arguments which have been occupying our attention by advancing other points in an appendix to his second chapter. We shall examine seriatim several points which he raises in the opening paragraph. It is perplexing, says the Canon, that Hooker changed his views on the origin of episcopacy. To this one may reply that often men change in age their youthful views and lay greater or less stress on certain points, while Hooker was by no means an old man when he died. Mr. Gladstone changed his mind on Home Rule when much older and Canon Shirley himself admits that he has changed his mind.<sup>7</sup> Again Hooker's statement about his changed opinions on the episcopate is quite guarded in tone. Keble also notes that Hooker, as a student, may have held more Calvinistic views than he did later, views like those of Peter Martyr and Rainolds.<sup>8</sup> Again, Canon Shirley thinks we find different conceptions of Timothy and Titus in books V and VII. Here we may reply that Hooker says in book VII that any powers held by bishops were held from the Church and also that a bishop in a missionary area would surely also act as a missionary presbyter.<sup>9</sup>

It would be wearisome to the general reader to continue taking all Canon Shirley's points one by one. Often they are of a minute nature, though this is no fault, for often it is by a number of small matters that a strong general conclusion can be obtained. But our preced-

ing paragraph has shown that reply can be made to several of them and it would not be an overstatement to say that of all the large number advanced there would be only five or so to which no rebuttal could be offered or no alternative solution propounded.

We may, by way of illustration, deal with an argument of a different nature advanced in this section. Canon Shirley wonders why Hooker allowed Saravia, a Dutch Reformed pastor with no episcopal ordination, to be his confessor if the dying man believed that episcopacy was of the "esse" of the Church. Here the reply is fairly obvious: the men were of mental affinity: Saravia's opinions were well known and he had received his orders abroad. In addition we may remark that it is not definite whether Saravia was episcopally ordained or no but it is definite that he was a prebend of Canterbury.<sup>10</sup> So far no single point in itself is really watertight.

This appendix is concerned with a number of small and detailed points. These have been examined separately by the writer but this article summarises conclusions. The arguments advanced by Canon Shirley fall under five heads. The first is the difference between the first five books and the "prelatical" outlook of book VII which "regarded Episcopacy" as being of the esse of the Church. This argument is perfectly valid except for one flaw which I feel vitiates it. The flaw is that in the passages from the 7th book Hooker is referring to the government or polity of the Church, a fact which the perusal of these passages in their context will reveal. But Hooker himself has plainly said that polity may be changed.<sup>11</sup>

Canon Shirley brings forward in his second section a number of small points. They are questions of style, the use of terms, the nature of special expressions and the significance of allusions. All these are matters which are notoriously liable to varying interpretations and it cannot be said that this section of Shirley's work is an exception to the general rule. This examination of specified passages really does not strengthen the case and two general remarks may be made concerning style. One is the general consensus that some final polishing of the last three books was needed when the author died and the other was that Hooker could use a harder style on occasion.<sup>12</sup> This would apply to several of the passages which are said to "display qualities of character unlike Hooker's" and can be urged without special pleading.<sup>13</sup>

The third point is that of style and is partly a repetition. This matter of style (in the context of Canon Shirley's phrase "the ornate style of Gauden rather than the majestic calm phrase of Hooker") is even more open to different opinions than usual. Few of us would always agree as to when a passage changed from majestic calm prose to an ornate style.

The passages cited under the fourth head, which Canon Shirley

claims suggest seventeenth century conditions, can without undue strain be applied to the Elizabethan period.

The fifth section comprises nine small matters of different kinds. It cannot be said that the inferences are incorrect in several cases cited but sometimes other explanations are possible and in other cases the evidence does not justify the conclusion. In other instances resemblances may well be caused by Gauden's knowledge of Hooker, and they are seldom close enough to justify us in saying definitely that the same man wrote them.

It cannot be said that the Canon's points are all wrong or that he has not made a contribution concerning the authorship of this book. He has done this. He has strengthened the case that all book VII can scarcely be regarded as genuine Hooker. This fact is very important for us in this age when the doctrine of the Church is so much to the fore and the seventh book of Hooker is bound to be widely used and quoted.

Our conclusion is forced upon us by the examination of the evidence. It is that it is difficult to accept as proven Canon Shirley's hypothesis that Gauden has tampered with book VII. Nevertheless combining the different strands of his argument and those of previous writers, we cannot feel at all confident about accepting all of book VII as the actual work of Hooker. This is the great merit of his fresh and suggestive treatment and the numerous points which he has raised. Hence we should be extremely chary about advancing any great claim on a theological or historical point based only on book VII. We should be equally slow in accepting such a claim if others make it.<sup>14</sup>

This verdict is reinforced by the fact that the trend of the past few years up to Canon Shirley's book had been to accept book VII as genuine. He states that while he began his research from the Anglo-Catholic position he has been obliged to conclude that Hooker cannot properly be regarded as a High Anglican.<sup>15</sup>

If we are careful about our treatment of material, if we are scrupulously careful not to infer too much, not to go further than the evidence warrants, then we shall inherit the intellectual integrity of Hooker and his judicial spirit even if we lack his massive scholarship.

1. Preface, p. 7ff.
2. pp. 87 and 107. (London 1940).
3. p. 45.
4. pp. 47ff.
5. "An Introduction to the Fifth Book of Hooker's Treatise of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity." (Oxford, 1907) p. 263.
6. VII, I, 3, 4; XI, 8; V, 2, 10; see Shirley, *op. cit.*, p. 126.
7. Preface, p. V.
8. Paget, *op. cit.* p. 80, and see Article

- "Rainolds, John" in *Dictionary of National Biography*.
9. Cf. *Apostolic Ministry*, p. 187 on "Early English Bishops." (ed. Kirk, K.E., London, 1946).
10. See Article in *Dictionary of National Biography*.
11. VII, V, 10 and XI, 8, cf. III, I, 14 and III, II, 1.
12. Shirley, p. 53 and Sisson, p. 109.
13. Shirley, p. 54.
14. Preface, p. V.

# THE PROTESTANT QUEST FOR A CHRISTIAN AMERICA 1830-1930

ROBERT T. HANDY<sup>1</sup>

*Union Theological Seminary*

American Christianity is so diversified and confusing and its material is of such vast extent that the scholars who have worked at the broader aspects of its history have had to bring to their study certain interpretative theses in order to find their way through the material at all. These interpretative theses, some implicitly held and others explicitly stated, some relatively adequate and others fairly weak, have paved the way for a great deal of intensive research, so that the young discipline of American Church History has a solid and illuminating body of material. Out of the research thus far undertaken have sprung new themes of interpretation, so that what may be called an "historiographical cycle" operates. This interaction of research and interpretation has functioned sufficiently well so that the overall picture of American Christian history grows steadily clearer. The process of clarification has, however, proceeded satisfactorily only to a point—to the Civil War. For the years since the Civil War, the picture has not yet come into sharp focus.<sup>2</sup> The interpretative theses thus far proposed have had serious limitations, and as a result the historiographical cycle has not operated to best advantage. The excellent monographic studies that have been done remain therefore somewhat unrelated and leave us with a rather fragmentary understanding of religious history since 1865. Yet in these years occurred decisive developments which must be further probed and clarified if we are to understand more fully the contemporary American religious scene, now so important a part of the total life of the world church. To be sure most of the significant movements of the period have received some attention, but they can be fully understood and their significance grasped only as they are delineated as part of the total history of American Christianity with the interconnections traced and the polarities analyzed. More fruitful and better-directed monographic studies will follow from the setting forth of fresh and rounded themes of interpretation; the historiographical cycle will then operate to better advantage for this important period.

That general overall interpretations of accepted adequacy have not yet appeared is not difficult to explain. Professor Cyril C. Richardson has reminded us that "... Church History is the tale of redemption; and while in a sense it embraces world history, its central thread is the story of the Holy Community (known under various guises and found in manifold and surprising places), which is the bearer of revelation and through which God acts in human history."<sup>3</sup> And Pro-

fessor James Hastings Nichols has noted that the gift of the church historian "... is not for abstractions, but for penetration and interpretation and ordering of the concrete."<sup>4</sup> But to penetrate and interpret and order the concrete, when that concrete is the Holy Community which in America is known under extremely various guises and found in most manifold and unbelievably surprising places, is a task which we would eschew were it not so vital.

The task is even more difficult for the years since the 1860's. For a whole culture was passing in those fateful years of civil strife. A strange new world emerged as Lincoln's successors took up their duties, a strange new world that provided a changed and perplexing milieu for the Christian Church. The most expressive comment I have ever heard regarding the profound transformations of post-Civil War America was by Henry Adams:

My country in 1900 is something totally different from my own country in 1860: I am wholly a stranger in it. Neither I, nor anyone else, understands it. The turning of a nebula into a star may somewhat resemble the change. All I can see is that it is one of compression, and consequent development of terrific energy, represented not by souls, but by coal and iron and steam.<sup>5</sup>

The difficulty of dealing with the church history of such a time in any full-orbed way is evident; the difficulty is in some ways heightened by the very richness of source materials: books, sermons, periodicals, yearbooks, catalogs, pamphlets, tracts, newspapers, not to mention the archives of the denominations, the great societies, and the interdenominational agencies. But despite the difficulties, there is need for fresh and comprehensive overall view or themes of interpretation to guide and direct the study of recent American Church History.

The views proposed a generation ago by Professor Henry Kalloch Rowe would today find favor in but few quarters. He suggested that the history of religion in America is the history of emancipation, emancipation successively from the authority of a state church, from the formal worship and preaching of the earlier divines, and from the traditional ideas of a Protestant Orthodoxy. In this broad setting, he treated the period since the Civil War under the topics "Rationalizing Religion," "Socializing Religion," and "Spiritualizing Religion."<sup>6</sup> This approach ignored large ranges of Christian life and thought, and viewed the rest through the narrow focus of one viewpoint. The dean of American church historians, William Warren Sweet, has focused his work mainly on pre-Civil War periods. His arduous researches, his most useful interpretative themes, and the bulk of his writings are devoted to the generations before 1860. Professor Arthur M. Schlesinger has given the clearest statement of a significant and fruitful approach to the recent period, an approach that has guided a great deal of research. In an article entitled "A Critical Period in American Religion, 1875-1900," Dr. Schlesinger advanced the fertile thesis that during the

last quarter of the nineteenth century organized religion in America faced two great challenges—the one to its system of thought, the other to its social program.<sup>7</sup> A rather important series of studies of Protestantism have followed this general approach.<sup>8</sup> It has its limitations, however. It focuses attention on the North and the East, on the great cities, on the seminary centers, and on the denominational and interdenominational headquarters, while it practically ignores important geographical areas and scarcely notices some large households of faith. An even more serious limitation of this approach is that in utilizing the biological analogy of stimulus-response it is easy to slip into the notion that Christianity was a static entity which, after being confronted with this or that external challenge, after a greater or lesser time responded with more or less adequacy. This can lead to a vastly oversimplified view of what the American churches were and contribute to a serious underrating of the inner drive and dynamic of the churches. Further, this approach enables the researcher to study the churches in terms of criteria which he has drawn from some other source than a consideration of what the churches consider to be their main task and role in society. This may be a perfectly legitimate undertaking, but it is not the primary role of the church historian. In this paper I would like to put forward in an exploratory way a view which is in many respects somewhat the reverse of the stimulus-response thesis. For the Protestantism that faced post-Civil War America was far from being a static entity continually being challenged by external forces. Rather it was an aggressive, dynamic form of Christianity that set out confidently to confront American life at every level, to permeate, evangelize, and Christianize it. The results of this Protestant thrust were ambivalent: on the one hand there were some notable achievements, but on the other there was an entanglement and partial envelopment by an increasingly pluralistic and secularized culture.

The middle third of the nineteenth century, roughly the years 1830-1860, was a period in which conservative, sectarian, evangelical Protestantism was a dominant force on the American scene. The French observer De Tocqueville remarked that "in the United States the sovereign authority is religious and consequently hypocrisy must be common; but there is no country in the world where the Christian religion retains a greater influence over the souls of men than in America . . ."<sup>9</sup> A domestic observer, Robert Baird, gave evidence repeatedly in his massive study of the vast hold of the evangelical churches on American life.<sup>10</sup> Recent study has underlined how important a force in pre-Civil War America was the traditional faith and morality of Protestantism. The attempt to understand the cataclysm of the Civil War itself leads directly to a consideration of the anti-slavery movement which grew out of and was stamped with the pattern



of pietistic Protestantism. Analyses of the national faith in democracy point to the decisive sway of Christian ideas; Professor Ralph H. Gabriel notes that "the foundation of this democratic faith was a frank supernaturalism derived from Christianity. The twentieth century student is often astonished at the extent to which supernaturalism permeated American thought of the nineteenth century."<sup>11</sup> The cultural dominance of Protestantism was illustrated in the transition to a public tax-supported school system; this transition was palatable to Protestants because the schools were rather clearly Protestant in orientation, though "non-sectarian." Protestant cultural leadership was reflected in the realm of higher education also—as a reporter in 1857 stated it, "We might go through the whole list of American colleges, and show that, with here and there an exception, they were founded by religious men, and mainly with an eye to the interests of the Church."<sup>12</sup> Historians whose major interests are not religious sometimes react with some surprise when they are forced to recognize how widespread Protestant influence was in the first part of the nineteenth century. Professor Whitney R. Cross, for example, in his recent and useful work on *The Burned-over District* records how widespread was the circulation of religious journals in the first part of the nineteenth century and how avidly they were read. He comments, "Now that theology is a very nearly dead subject, one finds it extremely difficult to realize how such journals could have an extensive appeal. But appeal they did, in demonstrable fashion."<sup>13</sup> Then he seeks to explain this appeal:

The puzzle of such an attraction resolves itself in two ways. First, a continuing itineracy often accompanied the paper, making local friends who in turn urged its support. A train of camp meetings, revivals, conventions, and quarterly sessions also kept adherents in contact. To others beyond immediate reach, the magazine, even were its heavy doses of theology not read, could be a constant reminder of intellectual and spiritual ties, while some leisurely seepage of doctrine originally imbibed by ear might filter into the inner consciousness. But suggestion of such indirect influence begs the major question. It seems an inescapable conclusion that a considerable proportion even of laymen read and relished the theological treatises.<sup>14</sup>

The great revivals of 1857-9 provide further evidence of the power and prestige of evangelical Protestantism; a recent student of them has noted that "there was remarkable unanimity of approval among religious and secular observers alike, with scarcely a critical voice heard anywhere."<sup>15</sup> There were of course Protestant groups whose interpretation of Christianity was not that of the conservative evangelicals, but they were small in comparison. The latter dominated the religious press, which had grown more than had the secular press in the twenty years before 1865 both in number of periodicals and in circulation.<sup>16</sup> Protestantism was fully committed to the principle of religious liberty and the voluntary method in religion; she was profiting from them and anti-



cipated continued progress under their sway. Finally, orthodox Protestantism had grown up with the individualism that characterized nineteenth century America, she had contributed to its rise and found it thoroughly congenial. In the words of Henry May, "Organized Protestantism supported the dominant economic beliefs and institutions even more unanimously than it accepted the existing form of government."<sup>17</sup> In many ways, the middle third of the nineteenth century was more of a "Protestant Age" than was the colonial period with its established churches.

At the close of the Civil War there were approximately five million Protestant church members out of an estimated population of some thirty-two million. Protestantism's influence of course extended far beyond her actual membership; the vast majority of Americans were encompassed in "popular" if not in "ecclesiastical" Protestantism.<sup>18</sup> The Protestants were an aggressive, self-confident, and surprisingly homogeneous group. To be sure they were divided into denominations among which considerable tension could arise, yet there was a fundamental similarity. De Tocqueville stated that "they all differ in respect to the worship which is due to the Creator; but they all agree in respect to the duties which are due from man to man. Each sect adores the Deity in its own peculiar manner, but all sects preach the same moral law in the name of God."<sup>19</sup> As the denominations faced their country they saw no reason why their influence should not continue to grow and their numbers increase, and they set out to evangelize and Christianize every aspect of American life. Their tremendous drive scattered churches across the West; church extension and church building were major focal points of Protestant concern throughout the nineteenth century. The restless energy of expanding Protestantism made possible the steady growth of the denominations and the erection of elaborate denominational structures. The inner dynamic of Protestantism led to the extension of existing co-operative agencies and societies as well as the development of many new ones, devoted to the promotion of revivals, the advancement of good causes, the furtherance of education, and the expansion of missions, home and foreign. The desire to permeate the life of America with the leaven of Christianity led to the adoption and imaginative use of such new instruments as the Y.M.C.A.<sup>20</sup> This religious drive to Christianize the nation was a phase of the energy that characterized American life in general at that time, but the evangelical fervor of the Protestant denominations intensified it.

As Protestantism set about her task of permeating and Christianizing American life, the very seriousness of her effort magnified the tendency of churches to absorb the characteristics of those whom they serve. The culture they were trying to Christianize grew steadily less

homogeneous after the Civil War. The horrors of reconstruction ploughed even deeper the chasm between South and North, and the great denominations of those sections, striving to reach every level of their respective sections, identified themselves warmly with their people and the broken spiritual ties were not healed. In the North and East particularly, the impact of evolutionary and historical thinking began to upset many, especially those of the educated classes. Their churches came to feel the obligation to understand the new conditions and mediate the gospel to such folk. Henry Ward Beecher, whose genius apparently lay largely in his ability to express to perfection what his huge congregations were thinking, declared "The providence of God is rallying forward a spirit of investigation that Christian ministers must meet and join. There is no class of people upon earth who can less afford to let the development of truth run ahead of them than they."<sup>21</sup> Ministers who moved in the circles where such currents were flowing tried to stand between the new modes of thought and the old theology; it was from among the ardent evangelicals that the liberal pioneers came. The full secularity to which the new ways of thinking could run was not then clear, and the older theology was often expressed in intransigent and stylized forms that repelled Christians sensitive to the needs of their day. Hence "liberalism" arose not so much from outside as from within, as prominent evangelicals seeking to live out their faith moved among people troubled by new intellectual trends.<sup>22</sup> In the major denominations of the North particularly the liberal trend was evident in the late nineteenth century, at times painfully evident.

A great deal of Protestant America, of course, lived in rural and small town areas where the new winds blew faint, and where the cyclones of the cultural centers had warned the faithful to erect storm signals. Hence the same post-Civil War years that are marked by the leftward trend are also characterized by the rightward movement of a counter-reformation which was rooted in the conservative, evangelical, revivalistic Protestantism of the earlier nineteenth century but showing a hardening and a narrowing of that tradition. Again, we see Protestant zeal at work, we see the Protestant churches identifying themselves with the concerns of the people, matching themselves to their level. The conservative reaction was of course by no means limited to the small town and rural areas; it swept into the great urban centers where city conditions were severing people from their cultural roots and where many of the city masses had a longing for the religious securities of their rural youth. An early dramatic expression of the conservative reaction was a hugely attended Prophetic Conference in New York in 1877, followed by one eight years later in Chicago. At these conferences the liberal drifts and compromises made with the

world were deplored; the prophetic and premillennial doctrines were vigorously proclaimed. The rightward trend was strengthened by the appeal to the authority of the infallible Bible. This stream of conservative thought was especially evident in the great Bible conferences: Niagara, Winona, Rocky Mountain. The conservative trend was supported and carried both to the greatest cities and the tiniest hamlets of America by the host of revivalists of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. One student of revivalism, writing twenty-five years ago, noted that "if collected in one volume with only a paragraph apiece, the revivalists of the last fifty years would form a book that would dwarf an unabridged dictionary."<sup>23</sup> The denominations were thus the locus of both leftward and rightward movements, they lost a great deal of inner unity and suffered sharp inner tensions, climaxed by the fundamentalist-modernist controversy of the 1920's. The "institutionalists" had their tasks cut out for them in reconciling the tension between "fundamentalists" and "experimentalists."<sup>24</sup> That they were as successful as they were is a tribute to their skill and tenacity in a day when churches of the same denomination a block or two apart could be moving in opposite directions. Yet even in those stormy years the contending parties were far more alike than unlike. Though their definitions of Christianity differed, still they were one in their effort to Christianize a nation, and this essentially missionary task was perhaps what held the denominations together. In 1912 Professor David S. Schaff wrote an article on "The Movement and Mission of American Christianity." It is significant to observe on what grounds his defense of the separation of church and state and the voluntary system in religion rests:

It is for the American church to show that the claim made for it is true, that it is the Scriptural method and is best adapted to develop Christian manhood, and to permeate society with the leaven of the Christian religion.<sup>25</sup>

To permeate society with the leaven of the Christian religion—this was the focus of Protestant energy and a source of Protestant unity despite diversity and tension.

The Christian social movements which arose in the years after the Civil War shared in the Protestant quest for a Christian America; their attention was focused on the economic, social, and political aspects of the nation's life, where revolutionary transformations were going on.

With the commitment to a philosophy of individualism that was so strongly evident in nineteenth century Protestantism, it was more difficult for her to adjust in this sphere than in some others, and the challenge-response thesis has had its widest and most valid application precisely at this point.<sup>26</sup> Some within the church, particularly where liberalism had paved the way, were prepared to move more swiftly and

more deeply into this field than others, yet the Christian social movement was not limited to the social gospel of the evangelical liberals—there was also an American Christian Commission, a Salvation Army, a rescue mission movement. In these movements both evangelical fervor and the drive to Christianize social relations are evident. *In His Steps* reads quite differently from *Christianizing the Social Order*, but they were both powerful expressions of a similar fundamental motif. There were crucial differences in theology and social philosophy between social gospel and conservative Protestants, but both groups strove to make America Christian. The Christian social movement was not only a response to external pressure, it was also a redirection, varied and often slow and cautious, of the inner vitality of Protestantism. Hence even at the point of its greatest validity, the challenge-response view must be used with care.

Despite its zeal and energy, Protestantism's dominance in culture and education so evident at the mid-nineteenth century mark, had ebbed by the 1920's; many who had come from Protestant backgrounds had become estranged from the church or grown indifferent to it; secularization was clearly on the increase. Protestant thought, especially in certain liberal circles, was showing the effect of culture on it, more than the reverse.<sup>27</sup> The racial, sectional, and class lines that were still drawn within Protestantism suggest rather disturbingly that the Protestant effort to permeate and Christianize society had not had too profound an effect even on her own social fabric. The tide, flowing strongly in Protestant favor in mid-nineteenth century, had clearly turned by the third decade of the twentieth century. At least part of the complex reasons for this can be seen in the operation of sociological forces which changed the structure of both Protestantism and the society in which she moved, and which diluted and dulled the Protestant thrust. Professor Leonard J. Trinterud has recently observed that American church historians are not making a serious attempt at a "Church" history, for

Most students of American Christianity have adopted the sociological approach, and thus—in strict definition—they have changed fields. They have become historians of the sociological phenomena of religion in American culture.<sup>28</sup>

No doubt Dr. Trinterud is pointing out to the church historian that his is a distinctive task that he alone can do. But in the attempt to clarify the religious history of the age that saw the rise of sociology in the effort to understand itself, to fail to use that discipline where it is relevant would be pedantry indeed. Dr. H. Paul Douglass has in a most illuminating way described the increase of the associative over the community aspects of American life in the period since the Civil War. The Protestant dominance in the early nineteenth century he finds to be "... a triumph of religion still on the communal level."<sup>29</sup> But with the rapid urbanization that took place thereafter, the groupings of so-

ciety became steadily less community-centered and more and more associative in nature, forming voluntarily around single interests. This has meant that

the church tends to get reduced merely to one of the many groups in which persons, detached from locality, associate together with segments of their personalities.

Moreover, each segment of personality, expressing itself in a different context and as a response to a different set of people, tends to project a separate set of moral standards. In this segmentation of culture we find the essence of urbanization, and, as well, the substitution of multiple moral standards for a single communal standard.<sup>30</sup>

Urbanization in both its rural and city phases has thus brought the church what Douglass goes so far as to call "the greatest inner revolution it has ever known." In effect, the church was in part remolded on the associative principle in the face of a segmented, pluralistic, associative culture. By this culture the Protestant thrust was diluted, blunted, absorbed. Though the churches, with their characteristic strengths and weaknesses and their varying definitions of themselves, strove zealously to penetrate and permeate American life, their impact was in some measure fragmented and disrupted by the nature of the society in which they worked. All this helps us to understand why Protestantism lost ground, why cults and sects have mushroomed since the Civil War, why denominations have often limited their ministrations to a given racial or nationality group, why local churches have often served a particular community interest. The associative nature of society in combination with the tendency of churches to identify themselves with the interests of the folk they serve contributed to the peculiar situation of American Protestantism, whereby the churches became entangled in cultural, racial, and class barriers instead of transcending them. Protestantism hoped to permeate and Christianize a society; instead she was partly enveloped by it.

But consideration of the weaknesses of Protestantism and her difficulties in an associative culture must not blind us to her major institutional achievements in the years since Appomattox. The percentage of Protestant church membership in the total population more than doubled, and in a time when the general population had tripled—no small achievement. Protestantism slightly more than kept pace with the remarkable rise in the level of wealth, and though this brought certain dangers, it testifies to denominational energy. Protestant zeal did not flag in those years; Professor Gaius Glenn Atkins has declared:

The first fifteen years of the twentieth century may sometime be remembered in America as the Age of Crusades. There were a superabundance of zeal, a sufficiency of good causes, unusual moral idealism, excessive confidence in mass movements and leaders with rare gifts of popular appeal. . . . Twentieth century church crusades were also a continuation, in social, moral and even political regions, of nineteenth century evangelism.<sup>31</sup>

With somewhat diminishing force, this pattern continued throughout



the 1920's. Protestant organizations grew steadily more extensive and complex as they dealt with the problems of the new age—to be sure the rise of denominational bureaucracy was an ambiguous blessing, but it reveals inner vitality. Though denominations were strained by theological tension and schisms resulted, major disruptions were avoided and unitive tendencies within denominations and denominational families operated ever more strongly as the years passed. Extensive home and foreign missionary activities were sustained throughout. Protestant vitality produced significant movements toward comity and co-operation, signalized in the establishment of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America in 1908 and in the formation of a number of other co-operative organizations. Counter-tendencies against cultural envelopment were at work; they have flowered in our own day in the theological revival and the ecumenical movement. On the institutional level the years since the Civil War were years of remarkable achievement. On the intellectual level such a case cannot be made; conservatives tended to defend their tradition in a somewhat uncreative and external way while liberals were so enamoured with modern thought that they were in danger of surrendering too much of their tradition.

For the view that has been suggested, that in the years since the Civil War an aggressive Protestantism hoped to strengthen further the position she had won in the middle third of the nineteenth century and further permeate American life and that the result was remarkable achievement and yet an entanglement and partial envelopment by a culture increasingly associative in nature, I find some substantiation in considering the history of Roman Catholicism in the same period. Roman Catholicism in 1865 claimed three million adherents—already by far the largest single religious group. It had been the church of the lower class, the immigrant, the city worker, and formed a religious enclave in Protestant America, a despised minority group for the most part. In the post-Civil War years a new spirit began to sweep through Catholicism. Henceforth it was to be less apologetic, less concerned with mere survival and more with consolidation and naturalization. It began to dream of permeating American life and remaking it in its image. These new motifs were evident at the meeting of the Second Plenary Council at Baltimore in 1866, where it was noted with enthusiasm that the number of churches and clergy had doubled since the First Plenary fourteen years before. The convert Father Hecker gave clear expression to the new hope of Catholics when in 1868 he suggested that perhaps by 1900 the majority of Americans would be Catholic. He announced as his avowed purpose not only to "Catholicize America" but also to "Americanize Catholicism." In 1868 also James Gibbons was consecrated bishop, and he is so much the symbol of the

Roman Catholicism of his time—he died in 1921—that those years can be styled “the age of Gibbons.” His desire to make the church at home in America, to naturalize the church, to identify her more closely with the life of America is evident in a remark he made about his popular book, *Faith of Our Fathers*:

Of all things about the book, the point that gratifies me most is that, although it is an explanation of the Catholic religion, there is not one word in it that can give offence to our Protestant brethren. There was originally a reference that seemed to displease Episcopalians, but when my attention was called to it, I ordered it to be expunged.<sup>32</sup>

Archbishop John Ireland was another prelate who expressed a dominant mood of the American Catholicism of the half-century after the Civil War. He once said, preaching before a Catholic conference:

It will not do to understand the thirteenth century better than the nineteenth. . . . We should speak to our age; we should be in it, and of it, if we would have its ear. For the same reason there is needed a thorough sympathy with the country. The Church of America must be, of course, as Catholic as even in Jerusalem or Rome; but as far as her garments assume colour from the local landscape, she must be American.<sup>33</sup>

Here is evident the operation of the desire to permeate society and to this end to identify the Church with it to a certain extent, the same concern we have seen in operation in Protestantism. In the case of Catholicism with her authoritarian structure, the counter-tendencies could act more swiftly. The decision of the Third Plenary Council of 1884 to develop a parochial school system on a large scale is one evidence of this. The resistance from Europe to “Americanization,” symbolized by Leo XIII’s Apostolic Letter, *Testem Benevolentiae*, to Cardinal Gibbons in 1899, checked the drift to a yet more distinctive American Catholicism and pointed to the end of the era of fraternization. Through all of this half-century, to be sure, the church had to struggle hard against the disruptive tendencies of particular national groups in her membership; in some areas the church was so identified with the interests of particular enclaves of immigrants that there was serious inner conflict. In Cahenslyism (1891) the disruptive tendencies of our associative, pluralistic culture had their impact in Catholicism, but they were resisted, and the foundation of present Catholic strength was cemented.

In conclusion, I want to underline the importance of this period for the Protestant church historian. With the contemporary theological revival that marks Protestantism there may come a tendency to neglect the importance of this period. For the Protestantism of the period, despite its zeal, exhibited a certain negativeness that we are seeking to escape today; the zeal was often exercised in a negative setting, directed against something. Liberalism certainly had its share of negative elements; the conservative reaction also was often far more powerful in denunciation than in affirmation. And even in charitable judgment, it



is hard to avoid finding a certain superficiality in a Protestantism that became so entangled in cultural patterns. Our generation should repeat these charges of negativeness and superficiality with hesitation, keeping in mind Professor H. Richard Niebuhr's warning that "the evil habit of men in all times to criticize their predecessors for having seen only half of the truth hides from them their own partiality and incompleteness."<sup>34</sup> But because of the negativeness and superficiality there may be a tendency to brush aside the period as a time of deviation from classical Protestantism which can serve mainly as a warning to us. I feel that the significance of the period is far deeper. It was then that the churches came face to face with the confused, troubled, fragmented, pluralistic, unstable new world of science and technology. The lessons learned from this first period of engagement with the kind of problems American churches are likely to be faced with for some time to come are important in their positive as well as their negative aspects. The achievements of that period provide much of the religious capital on which we still draw. The tensions that arose in that period have not entirely been resolved; historical study of them can help us to keep them from becoming destructive again. Many of the patterns of secularization that today keep men from a vital relationship to the Christian faith were developed and applied in this period. Professor Sidney E. Mead has suggested that the "secular" mind of today is to be saved by a ". . . return to God, and that this in turn can be furthered by stimulating him to remember his true antecedents—his true self. . . . This is to say that the so-called 'secularized' man of today, inside or outside of a church, is really indebted to the Christian tradition for the insights regarding human nature and destiny upon which he builds his structure of hope and aspiration—but that he is largely unaware of his indebtedness."<sup>35</sup> A profound knowledge of the religious history of the years since the Civil War can be useful in approaching such people, some of whom can be guided to see that the values they treasure are products of the Christian faith, and cannot be maintained long apart from positive Christianity. Finally, in many important respects the Church was carrying out its redemptive work on several frontiers, geographical, social, ecumenical—and as it appears that in the discernible future the Church will sojourn in an alien world, surely the history of the work of the Churches of Christ in that time of frontiers is highly significant.

1. I am greatly indebted to Professor Sidney E. Mead, in whose seminars the matters dealt with in this paper were confronted, for many stimulating suggestions, illuminating references, and constant encouragement.
2. It is customary in the periodization of American history to date a new period from 1865. As far as church history is concerned, the basic similarity of the Protestant pattern before and after 1865 suggests that a preferable periodization is 1830-1930, with a possible subdivision in 1890. The latter two-thirds of this period now needs particular attention. I am grateful to Professor Robert Hastings Nichols for an illuminating discussion of these matters.
3. "Church History Past and Present," *Union Seminary Quarterly Review*, V (November, 1949), 13.
4. "The Art of Church History," *Church History*, XX (March, 1951), 9.
5. *Letters, 1892-1918*, p. 279, quoted in Henry Steele Commager, *The American Mind: An Interpretation of American Thought and Character Since the 1880's* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950), pp. 134 f.
6. *The History of Religion in the United States* (New York: Macmillan, 1924), pp. vii f.
7. *Massachusetts Historical Society Proceedings*, LXIV (June, 1932), 523-47.
8. E.g., Aaron Ignatius Abell, *The Urban Impact on American Protestantism 1865-1900* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1943); B. J. Loewenberg, "Darwinism Comes to America," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, XXVIII (1941), 339-68; Henry F. May, *Protestant Churches and Industrial America* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1949).
9. Alexis De Tocqueville, *Democracy in America* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1945) I, 303.
10. *Religion in America* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1856), esp. pp. 536 ff., 586 f., 658 ff.
11. *The Course of American Democratic Thought: An Intellectual History Since 1815* (New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1940), p. 14.
12. Quoted by Donald G. Tewksbury in *The Founding of American Colleges and Universities Before the Civil War* (New York: Teachers' College, 1932), p. 56.
13. *The Burned-over District: The Social and Intellectual History of Enthusiastic Religion in Western New York, 1800-1850* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1950), p. 108.
14. *Ibid.*, pp. 108 f.
15. J. Edwin Orr, *The Second Evangelical Awakening in Britain* (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, Ltd., 1949), p. 21.
16. Winfred Ernest Garrison, *The March of Faith: The Story of Religion in America Since 1865* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1933), p. 10.
17. May, *op. cit.*, p. 6.
18. H. Paul Douglass, "Religion—The Protestant Faiths," in Harold E. Stearns (ed.), *America Now: An Inquiry into Civilization in the United States* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1938), pp. 505-27.
19. De Tocqueville, *op. cit.*, I, 303.
20. Cf. C. Howard Hopkins, *History of the Y.M.C.A. in North America* (New York: Association Press, 1951).
21. Ernest Trice Thompson, *Changing Emphases in American Preaching* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1943), p. 86.
22. Cf. Daniel Day Williams, *The Andover Liberals: A Study in American Theology* (New York: King's Crown Press, 1941); cf. also George Hammar, *Christian Idealism in Contemporary American Theology* (Uppsala: A.-B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln, 1940), especially the note on p. 153, where he stresses the evangelical center of Rauschenbusch's liberal theology.
23. Grover C. Loud, *Evangelized America* (New York: Dial Press, 1928), p. 257.
24. Terminology used by Kirsopp Lake, cf. Gaius Glenn Atkins, *Religion in Our Times* (New York: Round Table Press, 1932), p. 219.
25. *American Journal of Theology*, XVI (January, 1912), 65.
26. Note especially the cautious use of it in C. Howard Hopkins, *The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism 1865-1915* ("Yale Studies in Religious Education," Vol. XIV [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940]).
27. Cf. Arnold Nash (ed.), *Protestant Thought in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Macmillan, 1951).
28. "Some Notes on Recent Periodical Literature on Colonial American Church History," *Church History*, XX (December, 1951), 73.
29. Douglass, *loc cit.*, p. 514.
30. *Ibid.*, p. 515.
31. Atkins, *op. cit.*, pp. 156 f.
32. Will, Gibbons, II, 886 f., quoted by Theodore Maynard, *The Story of American Catholicism*, (New York: Macmillan, 1941), pp. 550 f.
33. Willard L. Sperry, *Religion in America* (New York: Macmillan, 1946), p. 219.
34. *The Kingdom of God in America* (Chicago: Willett, Clark & Co., 1937), p. xiii.
35. "The Task of the Church Historian," *The Chronicle*, XII (July, 1949), 139. Cf. John Baillie, *Invitation to Pilgrimage* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1942).

## THE POLITICAL IMPACT ON RELIGIOUS DEVELOPMENT IN URUGUAY

RUSSELL H. FITZGIBBON

*University of California at Los Angeles*

It is an easy and not an essentially inaccurate generalization to say that Latin America is a Catholic world. If we begin to apply the generalization more narrowly, caution and reservations become increasingly necessary. In parts of Haiti, for example, the Catholic veneer is thin. A useful book about Mexico published some years ago carried the intriguing title *Idols Behind Altars*. Its author did not mean the connotation exactly as it sounds but she might have so meant it. In large parts of Indo-America, especially in those areas such as the Andean highlands and parts of Central America and southern Mexico where the pre-Columbian Indian cultures were best developed and most tenacious, Catholicism has had to make a degree of accommodation which adopted and adapted various pagan practices. The same process occurred about a millennium earlier when Christianity moved into pagan Germany.

In Uruguay, too, qualifications and reservations need to be made and caution used, but for different reasons. No early Indian culture or pantheism lived or lasted in Uruguay. There may have been idols but the Charrúas, Chanás, and other aborigines were in no position to put them into competition with altars. And yet Uruguay is probably less strongly Catholic than any other country in Latin America. That broad and possibly gratuitous generalization even includes Mexico, where the bitterest friction ever to characterize the Church-State issue in Latin America has flamed and flamed again over long decades.

The explanation of the religious picture in Uruguay is an involved and curious complex of social, intellectual, political, psychological, and perhaps other elements. Three historic or demographic factors contribute to an interpretation or explanation of the weakened Catholic position in Uruguay: effective Spanish colonization did not begin until the eighteenth century, by which time the religious fervor of the earlier generations and centuries had in considerable measure atrophied; during that colonial period Uruguay remained largely an ecclesiastical appendage of Buenos Aires and its intensity of spiritual development and devotion was correspondingly diminished. The oldest Uruguayan diocese, that of Montevideo, dates only from 1878, more than half a century after Spanish authority was expelled from the country. In the second place, the revolutionary period was characterized by a large influx of foreigners, especially English and French, who were either non-Catholic or only nominally Catholic. Third, the

large immigration beginning late in the nineteenth century, while it came in great part from Catholic countries, represented social and economic strata which were often of less than fervent attachment to the Church.

And in considerable degree it is again, as at so many points, the lengthened shadow of a man—President José Batlle y Ordóñez—which helps account for how Uruguay worships, or fails to worship, today. Batlle early developed a skeptical and questioning attitude toward the Catholic Church. His religio-intellectual progression in that wise somewhat resembled that of Benito Juárez in Mexico. The similarity stops at an early point, however, because the Church had been extremely strongly entrenched in Mexico, economically and politically as well as ecclesiastically, while in pastoral, gaucho-inhabited Uruguay its hold had never been as solid. True, the constitution of 1830 (drafted by an assembly including five clerics) had firmly and formally established an orthodox relationship of Church and State. It had said that "The religion of the State is the Roman Catholic Apostolic," (although other religions were tolerated). That was about as flat a statement as could be made, but the constitution also began its preamble "In the name of God, the All Powerful, Author, Legislator, and Supreme Conservator of the Universe." Moreover, the president was required to take his oath "before God, our Lord, and these Holy Evangels."

Even before Batlle's time the Church suffered blows in Uruguay. Franciscan convents were suppressed in 1838. The Jesuits were expelled in 1859 (but allowed to return in 1865). A law of 1880 deprived the Church of its previously almost exclusive control over cemeteries and over the registration of vital statistics and the solemnization of marriages, though some latitude for the marriage of non-Catholics had previously existed.

A tenet of Batlle's program in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries came to be that the two institutions, one ecclesiastical and spiritual, the other political and governmental, must be separate. So confirmed did he become in that conviction, so far did he go in translating it into reality, that many persons aver that Batlle became an atheist. It is difficult to say. The several lines between atheism, agnosticism, reism, freethinking are hard to draw. Batlle became more interested in positive reform of other sorts, economic, social, political, and once his convictions on religious matters were formed, they remained to color and influence but not to take precedence over his interests in other areas. His magnetism and force of personality were sufficient to transmit the stamp of his ideas on religion to the dominant batllista wing of the Colorado party. It is today a staunch supporter of the principle of separation of Church and State and is,

on the whole, unsympathetic toward Catholicism and, in considerable measure, other denominations as well.

Colorados, relatively more than other Uruguayans, have become adherents of Freemasonry, a fraternity which has prospered more in Uruguay than in most Latin American countries. Individual batllistas in some cases retained a sense of religiousness and even Batlle himself was known privately on rare occasions to render aid and comfort to such an organization as the Y.M.C.A., partly, perhaps, because of its concern with physical education. On the whole, however, the great mass of the followers of Batlle were weaned away from an attachment to the Catholic Church without substituting therefor any other denominational affiliation.

The result was a large amount of freethinking in Uruguay. The Catholic Church has suffered correspondingly. Some of its priests assert that eighty-five per cent of Uruguayans are Catholic.<sup>1</sup> That is a figure which cannot be substantiated, of course, for permanent want of any accurate religious census,<sup>2</sup> but which in all probability is based on a large amount of wishful thinking. Ardent batllistas put the percentage of Catholic adherence far lower, but their individual estimates vary so greatly that it is perhaps not possible to strike a mean.

The Catholic Church has suffered quantitatively. Both in Montevideo and in the country the number of both churches and priests is considerably smaller than one finds in most Latin American countries. The churches are usually smaller and more modest than in other parts of Catholic America. Even the cathedral in Montevideo is much less impressive than those in various other Latin American cities of comparable size and importance. In Bogotá or Quito or Lima the clerical black is in constant evidence—but not in Montevideo or in the smaller interior cities. The Catholic clerical personnel includes one archbishop, two bishops, and some 250 secular priests. This figures out to a clientele of about 10,000 Uruguayans per priest; in Spain, on the other hand, the ratio is about twelve times as favorable for the Church. As is common in most Latin American countries men have fallen further away from the Church than women. Children? Well, it depends to a large degree on the family. In the strongly Catholic families the children are likely to receive a strict indoctrination in Catholic practices and principles; in other families, as the twig is bent—

Not only has there been a decrease in numbers of Catholic adherents, but also a dilution of religiosity has often taken place among those nominally professing Catholicism. When a bus or streetcar passes a Catholic church virtually none of the men doff their hats and only a fraction of the women are to be seen crossing themselves.<sup>3</sup> Jewelry stores display relatively few crosses or other religious insignia for sale. Vested Catholic clergy do not accompany funeral processions

to the cemeteries. In municipal cemeteries Catholic crosses are to be found over graves, it is true, but, Consul La Orden observed, they are intermingled with "pagan and Masonic symbols, obelisks, triangles, Jewish stars, profane sculptures, and irreligious inscriptions." Week-day attendance at Catholic churches is small. Increasing numbers of Uruguayan women enter those churches with heads bared.

Perhaps less superficial than such evidences is the great decrease in religious processions. This decrease is due in some part to an official governmental frown several years ago. The explanation was that religious processions caused an undue distraction in children's schooling. No famous Catholic sanctuary exists in all of Uruguay nor does the country have any universally recognized patron saint. The pilgrimage to the statue of the Miraculous Virgin atop the Cerro de Verdún near the city of Minas is too recent a development to have become invested with much of an institutional air of sanctity.

The official separation of Church and State in Uruguay was made by the constitution of 1917, effective in 1919. It provided that all religious cults were to be free; the State supported no religion; it recognized the ownership by the Catholic Church of all temples constructed wholly or partially with national funds except those small churches intended for service as "asylums, hospitals, jails, or other public establishments"; it declared tax exempt all temples intended for worship by any religious faith. The constitution further omitted any reference to deity in the presidential oath and entirely discarded a preamble with its invocation of divine aid. A by-product of the disestablishment was the raising of a popular fund of \$1,000,000 as an endowment to compensate the Church for its loss of governmental financial support. A further consequence was the termination of diplomatic relations with the Vatican in 1919.

By the time of the taking effect of that new basic law in 1919 batllismo had had some eight years (counting from the beginning of Batlle's second term as president) in which to consolidate itself. The three decades and more since 1919 have simply served to confirm the government, consistently Colorado through the period, in its anticlerical position. The new constitution of 1934 made no change of importance in the provisions, nor did the dictatorship of Gabriel Terra from 1933 to 1938 attempt to turn the clock back. The new constitution of 1951 left the relationship unchanged.

The government's chief avenue of implementation of its policy of separation of Church and State has been through its control of the public school system. Private schools exist in Uruguay, of course, both those organized on a cultural basis (the French lycée or the British school, for example) and those operated by churches. The latter include



both Catholic and Protestant. The government, operating through the autonomous councils which control primary and secondary education, specifies a large core of subject matter which is required of both private and public schools. What the former ones add on top of that can be in the nature of religious instruction if they wish, but there is little time left for work beyond the officially prescribed curriculum.

The public schools, of course, avoid anything savoring of religion. It would be worth a teacher's job were she to read anything from the Bible, make sympathetic comment about things religious, or similarly flout the canons. Uruguay is not a country which, like Colombia, for example, leaves a large part of the operation of the schools to the responsibility of the Church and hence, in view of the fact that public education looms as large as it does, the government has a potent instrument at hand in forging and applying its policy.

*La Semana Santa* is in almost all parts of Latin America a well established institution in which the Church simply takes the lead in organizing and directing what is nominally a major religious celebration but in actuality becomes a public if not a governmental festival. Not so in Uruguay. For some years past in that country Holy Week has been officially *La Semana de Turismo* and, though it comes at a time when the season is getting on toward winter, the government goes through straight-faced efforts to dedicate the several days to the divine cause of tourism. The people in the street don't take the change of labels too seriously—"Tourist Week" is only an official and not a popular designation—but the renaming is symptomatic. Many business houses are closed during the week but again caution in interpretation is necessary. The reason is not to any great extent the fact that the proprietors so respect the faith of their fathers that they will not profane the week by the sordid business of selling goods. The paternalistic government specifies two weeks of annual paid vacations for the employees of business firms and it is, then, simply convenient for the owners to make that particular week one of the two. The more so since the favorable exchange rate contributes to what amounts to almost a mass exodus of Montevideanos to Buenos Aires and other vacation spots during the week. Fewer home customers, less need for clerks, Tourist Week (or Holy Week, as you will) observed—the whole thing works itself out in a reasonably neat pattern. Doubtless the ointment's only flies are perceived by the store owners who see all that good trade going across the river to Buenos Aires and by the Catholic Church which deplores this hedonistic "desecration" of Holy Week.

In similar vein, though with less of the economic overtones, Christmas Day is officially The Day of the Family. The new appellation is viewed by the people with still more of a tongue-in-cheek atti-



tude, as if the government must be humored in going to even absurd lengths in grinding a favorite ax, but again the action is symptomatic.

The government has, since 1885, required civil marriage in Uruguay. A church ceremony, Catholic or otherwise, is permissible but may not supplant the civil ceremony (which increasingly becomes the only one). The possibility and the increasing practice of divorce also undermine traditional Catholic control over the social structure.

A footnote is added by a curious little journalistic practice. There is obviously a close entente between batllismo and the government. It is difficult to describe or define the party-government connective tissue but it is clearly apparent—not as close, probably, as in the case of Mexico's dominant Institutional Revolutionary party and not as close, certainly, as in the instances of the former Nazi and Fascist parties in their relationship to the German and Italian governments. But, as the *Osservatore Romano* can speak unofficially for the Vatican, *Pravda* for the Kremlin, or *Democracia* for the Peronista-dominated *Casa Rosada* in Buenos Aires, so can *El Día* reflect the viewpoint of the Uruguayan government, in many cases, without assuming all of the responsibility of an official publication. It is the paper founded in the 1880's by Batlle himself and it still carries the most authentic banner of batllismo. The tone of *El Día* is often ruggedly anti-clerical. Its most obvious red flag is its persistent practice of spelling "Dios" with a lower-case *d*.

It is difficult to say, and perhaps the architects of batllismo do not themselves consciously know, to what extent the negative attitude of the man, the party, and the government has been the cause of the advanced and positive position of those in control in Uruguay toward matters and opportunities of social service and social reform. Certainly it seems a tenable argument that the social consciousness of the batllistas may at least have been intensified by the insensible wish to substitute something for the socio-spiritual orientation and expression normally found within the Catholic orbit. If Nature abhors a vacuum, the emptiness of a portion of the batllista horizon may in like manner have been filled in by what at least the party leaders would regard as a sublimated course of action. Such a rationale might not seem so logical in the freer intellectual setting of another area but to those who are familiar with the subtle and all-pervasive psychological influences of a long-standing Catholic society the interpretation might appear more valid. At least, it is advanced by some Uruguayans who seek to account for a political trend which in certain respects goes far beyond the experience of most Latin American countries.

Under normal circumstances we might look for some roughly Newtonian development of a "law of politics" and assume that in the

political area, too, we could find, for every action, an equal and opposite reaction. That would mean that, religion-wise, the batllistas being strongly anticlerical, another major party (logically the Blancos) should be as strongly pro-Catholic. But politics cannot be reduced to the formulas and laws of physics. Sometimes a strong political movement will operate to shift the whole center of political gravity rather than just to magnify and continue counterbalancing the extremes. The position of the Uruguayan Blancos or Nationalists vis-à-vis religion, and especially Catholicism, is a case in point.

By analogy to physics the Blancos, a traditionally and strongly conservative party, should be ardent defenders of the Catholic Church. But they are not. The shift in the center of gravity carried the party over into a semblance of official neutrality. Many Blancos were and are professing Catholics but regard it as a matter "of private conscience." So disappointing has this attitude been to Catholic spokesmen, especially in view of the professional conservatism of the Nationalist (or Blanco) party, that the Blancos have been referred to as characterized by "agnosticism," "spiritual denaturalization," and "dogmatic debility."

The Catholic answer to this Colorado hostility and Blanco neutrality in the field of politics was the organization of a professedly Catholic party. The initiative was taken by a bishop in 1872 and resulted in the establishment of the Unión Católica del Uruguay, a name later shortened to the Unión Cívica. This party for many years represented an orthodox Catholic point of view reflected in its quadripartite aims of "Religion, Fatherland, Family, and Property." It usually maintained a small congressional delegation composed of men who, because of personal integrity and dignity, enjoyed a high political reputation. It rejected the concept of statism involved in what it claimed was "Colorado socialism," although it was willing to accept subsidiary intervention by the State to achieve ends of social justice. The Civic Union attacked gambling, divorce, and dueling. More recently, under the liberal leadership of Dr. Dardo Regules, the Civic Union has disappointed the most orthodox and conservative spokesmen of Catholicism by veering in part toward the social and political philosophy of Jacques Maritain. The publication of the newspaper *El Bien Público* provides an authentic voice for Uruguayan Catholicism.

The Church in Uruguay has also operated through a number of subordinate agencies, some of which have at times shown more vigor than the formal Church organization itself. The parent of them, so to speak, was the Catholic Club of Montevideo, dating back to 1875. Later organizations included labor groups, a Social Union, a Women's League, an Economic Union, and Catholic Action. Secular clergy have at times been surpassed in their energy by members of the various

orders. Those working in Uruguay at different periods have included the Jesuits, Mercedarians, Salesians, Capuchins, Maronites, and others.

Uruguayan Catholicism in recent years has shown some rebirth of activity and vigor. If it has suffered quantitatively, a counterreaction may have brought a qualitative improvement. The flattery of imitation of what some Catholics refer to as the "notorious" Y.M.C.A. has led the Church to establish a similar organization for the *juventud* of Montevideo, although such Catholic activity is not as vigorous in Uruguay as, for example, in Belgium, Canada, or France. Some Catholic priests have demonstrably become characterized by more of a sense of mission. Various Catholic festivals are advertised more widely and openly than was formerly done. The Church, by and large, has experienced a lift, much of it intangible but none the less real.

A case in point illustrating the Catholic Church's new animation (and therefore perhaps deserving of a brief description) is its recent work with laboring groups, urban and rural. Catholic labor unions, as such, date back only to 1947, but they had an institutional ancestor in the earlier *uniones gremiales* or guild unions. They also represented an inherited tradition of Catholic interest in certain aspects of social welfare implemented through the *Círculo Católico de Obreros*. This organization is not, as its name would suggest, exclusively a workers' group; it includes many employers and conservative professional men whose economic interests are not necessarily parallel to those of labor. The Catholic Workers' Circle was established in Uruguay before 1900, as it was in other countries, and was a direct product of the social philosophy embodied in the famous encyclical *Rerum Novarum* issued by Leo XIII in 1891 (reaffirmed and reenforced by Pius XI's *Quadragesimo Anno* in 1931).

The Workers' Circle has broader interests than just those of organized dispensaries and a sanatorium, and renders other social services. It controls union activity by means of its social action committee. This committee organizes and benevolently controls a new Catholic union, operating through "men of confidence" in the labor union itself. The whole organization of Christian Syndicalism, as it is called, is not large: there are but five affiliated unions in Montevideo and three in other cities, with a total membership of only about 2,500. One of the most interesting member groups is the Christian Syndicate of Chauffeurs, a sort of guild rather than a true union, for private chauffeurs only (taxi drivers excluded).

The Catholic labor unions, small though they are, represent an element of stability but they face a basic dilemma. The Uruguayan worker is less concerned with the "imperialism" of the United States, of which the Communist would persuade him, or the Soviet brand

of imperialism, as presented by the Catholic leadership, than he is with the "imperialism" of Uruguayan employers. Are devout Catholic laborers, then, to be workers first and Catholics second, or are they to reverse that allegiance? The two affiliations are at times in at least potential conflict and as a result the larger movement of Uruguayan organized labor scarcely knows whether to regard the Catholic unions as a part of itself or not.

Rural labor organization affiliated with the Catholic Church presents different problems, objectives, and aspects. As of 1948 the Church claimed an affiliation of some 6,000 rural families (not restricted exclusively to Catholics, as is also true of the membership of some urban unions) in about sixty local unions grouped in three regional confederations. These unions have in general had more influence and impact than their urban counterparts and they have, on the whole, earned the respect of many segments of Uruguayan society.

The partial religious vacuum left by the decrease of Catholic membership and general influence would seem to have been a situation made to order for the introduction and diffusion of Protestant activity. It is true that Protestant Churches have been more vigorous, for a longer time, and in more varied ways in Uruguay than in possibly any other Latin American country. But it would be short of the mark to say that they have entirely filled the void caused by the decrease in Catholic operation and membership. Large numbers of Uruguayans have weighed the anchor of any sort of church affiliation, Catholic or Protestant, and seem permanently indifferent to church membership or activity. This is perhaps relatively more true of the professional classes than of others, but it cannot be accurately measured with any social or economic yardstick.

Some of the Catholics, especially the clergy, refer to the Protestant denominations as sects, perhaps thinking that some artful condemnation is thereby implied. Some Protestants speak of their own groups as Evangelical, seeking in that way to avoid the negative connotations of the more widely used term. The Catholic attitude toward the Protestant groups has been, as might be expected, one of complete aloofness. None the less, whether from lack of vigor or for some other reason, the Catholic hierarchy has not at any time attacked the spread or activity of Protestantism by means of a pastoral letter as Catholic officials across the river in Argentina have done. Protestant Churches in several instances have exploited a subtle psychological fact by building edifices more than normally imposing as Protestant practice goes in Latin America. Latinos, especially in the lower economic and social levels, are often struck by display, and the narrowing of the normal gap in impressiveness of church architecture between Catholic and

Protestant structures in Latin America thus probably operates in some small degree in favor of certain Protestant churches.

Some, at least, of the Protestant Churches have been much more energetic than the Catholic in carrying their message to the people at large. This has meant a missionary zeal which has likely been a major factor in antagonizing the more conservatively operating Catholics. Indeed, a line is hard to draw for some of the Protestant Churches between what is missionary work and what is activity of a more routine nature.

The oldest and largest of the major Protestant denominations working in Uruguay is the Methodist Church. Its Uruguayan operations may be considered as typically reflected, in lesser degree, by several of the other Protestant denominations. The history of Methodist work in Uruguay goes back to the late 1860's and has, quite naturally, been confined principally to Montevideo. Two large (and several small) Methodist churches function in Montevideo, one primarily for members of the foreign community, the other for Uruguayans. More recently, Methodist churches have been established in Salto and Paysandú, the country's next largest cities, and the denomination has taken beginning steps toward branching out in other directions. Some Catholic clergy regard it as "aggressive" but Protestants would doubtless interpret the description as meaning simply that it has made more headway than any other non-Catholic church.

Aside from its more conventional work, the principal "outlets" of the Methodist Church in Uruguay have been education and social work. For many decades past it has operated a school, now one of the largest private schools in the country, with about 1000 students. It offers both Uruguayan- and American-type curricula and many of its alumni have now taken an established place in Montevidean life. In the Cerro across the bay from Montevideo proper the Methodist Church undertakes a type of settlement work through a social service center.

Montevideo's Anglican congregation worships in a church on the river front in the Old City, a symbolic location because it marks the spot where the English forces first breached the walls of the city when they stormed and captured it in 1807. The Anglican group is chiefly High-Church and it engages much less than do most of the Protestant denominations in missionary and related activities. Among others of the older and better known Protestant denominations the Baptists and German Lutherans both have churches in Montevideo.

Other religious groups working at least in Montevideo and in some instances in the *campo* as well include the Russian Orthodox Church, Jews, Waldensians, Seventh Day Adventists, the Church of



God, Christian Scientists, Mormons, Jehovah's Witnesses, Mennonites, and the Salvation Army. In some cases these groups are only late entrants into the Uruguayan scene. Many young Mormon missionaries (some say more than a hundred), working in their familiar pairs, have entered Uruguay since World War II. The Waldensians are the oldest Protestant group in Uruguay and have worked in the vicinity of Colonia Suiza, east of Montevideo, for about a century. Both the young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations have long been vigorous in Montevideo and each has established itself in the affections of succeeding generations of Uruguayan youth. Each occupies its own building in central Montevideo.

Protestantism has, on the whole, made only a dent in converting Uruguayans. It seems unlikely that the country will ever become predominantly Protestant, although it is entirely possible that an increasing leaven in the social structure will result from the degree of freedom allowed all faiths, including the Protestant. The social and intellectual impact of Protestantism has undoubtedly been greater than the scanty numbers on its church rolls would indicate.

An underlying, and perhaps the most important, significant feature of the religious picture in Uruguay is that that little country gives us the best example of a Latin American land that can take its Catholicism or leave it, and all in a peaceful, evolutionary fashion. The bitter flowering of anticlericalism in Mexico left an aftermath that still mars that country's landscape. Chile and other Latin American states have broken the ties that previously connected them formally with the Church, but in those instances the populations have usually remained strongly, if not fanatically, Catholic. France gives us a European example somewhat resembling the Uruguayan experience: a situation where freethinking, agnosticism, religious indifference have affected considerable segments of the population of a previously staunchly Catholic country. The details differ so as between France and Uruguay, however, that it is unsafe to push the comparison too far.

In the case of the South American republic we have an example, almost Latin America's only instance, of a country working out a social and economic program with virtually no impact from the pervasive and subtle influence of the Roman Church. It is much more than just a simple severance of formal Church-State relations. Excepting the case of Mexico, where it developed in a sort of pathological fashion, Uruguay's is the first large-scale American experiment in the rejection of the norms and mores of a dominant Church as projected especially into the political realm but felt also in economic, social, and intellectual spheres. Whether this emancipation from a conditioning Catholic

milieu is a step in the right or the wrong direction is of course a matter of individual and highly personal opinion. But, without doubt, it is a significant step.

1. But a strongly Catholic layman, a franquista Spanish diplomat in Uruguay, wrote a few years ago that "Catholic Uruguayans do not appear to form a majority among its citizens." *Vide* Ernesto La Orden, *Uruguay, el Benjamín de España*, p. 296. Not only would it seem that Catholics represent a minority but there is evidence that they are at least relatively declining in numbers.
2. The national census of 1908 (the latest taken in Uruguay, although another is scheduled for 1952) included certain data on religious affiliations. The total population of 1,042,686 was classified as follows: Catholic, 637,681 (61.16 per cent); Protestant, 16,498 (1.58 per cent);
- freethinkers, 150,669 (14.45 per cent); unspecified or "without religion," 237,838 (22.82 per cent). The total number of inhabitants more than fourteen years of age (the usual age of confirmation) was 614,222. They were classified: Catholics, 430,095 (70.02 per cent); Protestant, 12,232 (1.99 per cent); freethinkers, 126,425 (30.59 per cent); unspecified or "without religion," 45,470 (7.4 per cent).
3. Some persons account for this on the basis of the degree of sophistication of the Uruguayan population which allegedly leads them to forego formalistic or, some would say, "superstitious" manifestations.



PROF. SWEET'S RELIGION AND CULTURE IN AMERICA

A Review Article

SIDNEY E. MEAD

*University of Chicago*

William Warren Sweet, *Religion in the Development of American Culture 1765-1840*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952. Selected Bibliography & Index. xvi + 388 pages. \$3.50

The name of William Warren Sweet has become practically synonymous with American Church history, and this book covers the period during which, according to his major and often reiterated interpretative thesis, the crucial developments in that history took place. Such considerations make this a publication of unusual interest and significance. And since Professor Sweet's work is quite likely to condition the study of and research in American Church history for a generation or more to come, a great respect for it does not exempt us from extended and critical examination of it.

Professor Sweet's mastery of the subject to which he has devoted a long and distinguished career, his extraordinary ability to pull things together and get them down in concise, readable, historical narrative, and his superb work as a teacher and director of research (he was godfather to more than thirty Ph. D. dissertations on aspects of American Church History), need no eulogies. His work will stand on its own merits as a monument marking the recognition of a much neglected area of American history. Recognizing this, the intention here is to examine the present volume in the contexts of the author's total work, the study of American history, and the history of Christianity.

First it should be noted that Professor Sweet never regarded himself primarily as a Church historian. Nor, despite the fact that he has spent much of his active life in theological schools, did he think that his primary duty was to train ministers. Rather he interpreted his call to the chair of American Church History at the University of Chicago as "a chance of helping to develop an entirely new field of history."<sup>1</sup> Enlarging upon this, and summarizing his work at Chicago, he stated that he always conceived his task to be

to remind secular historians of the religious factors that have helped to shape America; and to remind denominational and other historians of religion of the significance of other religious groups and the secular forces in shaping their particular groups.<sup>2</sup>

True to this conception of his job, his work has remained oriented to the discipline of "secular" American history rather than to that of Church history as such. Recognition of this fact would seem to obviate such recurring criticism of his work as that implied in Mr. Trinterud's recent lament that "most students of American Christian-

ity . . . have changed fields."<sup>3</sup> Professor Sweet may have devoted his life to cultivating the wrong field, or to cultivating the right field in the wrong way as other critics have suggested.<sup>4</sup> This is debatable. But he can hardly be accused of changing fields. And that his informing genius was not entirely in error is evidenced both by the greatly increased study of religion in so-called "secular" departments of American Universities, and by the heightened status and nature of the study of American Church history in the Seminaries. When Professor Sweet began his work at the University of Chicago, American religious history as such was almost non-existent as a field of historical endeavor, and in graduate schools was generally frowned upon and discouraged. His work has contributed no small part to the effecting of the important change in this respect that has taken place.

Mr. Trinterud's further observation that by and large historians of American Christianity have defined their field in such fashion as to make them "historians of the sociological phenomenon of religion in American culture"<sup>5</sup> has more point in application to Professor Sweet's work and indeed might almost be said to be documented by the present volume alone. Why these historians in general and Professor Sweet in particular fell into this kind of aberration is understandable enough, granted the prevailing conceptions of history which informed the historiography of their formative years. But this in no wise excuses their heirs in the discipline of Church history from the responsibility to wrestle with the problems thus passed on to a more theologically and churchly minded generation. And that responsibility means that sooner or later this generation must try the basic premises which informed the historiography of its fathers in the crucible of its own theological orientation.

Meanwhile it is only fair, and methodologically more appropriate, first to examine their works on their own premises as far as possible. This I shall try to do with Professor Sweet's work, using the present volume as the locus of attention. In doing so it is necessary to range quite far and in several directions. But basically the examination is woven around the suggestion that even when we accept at face value his explicitly stated conception of his task and proceed to the examination of his work as a whole, it appears to be based upon two different, if not necessarily in all aspects mutually exclusive, conceptions of history writing. And this implies far-reaching consequences for the study of American Church history, some of which we shall try to make explicit.

The two conceptions of history writing are perhaps best represented in America by the work and "schools" of John Bach McMaster on the one hand and Frederick Jackson Turner on the other. To characterize these two schools without precise definition, it may be said

that the former built upon a conception of "scientific" history at a time when "there was as yet little explicit appreciation of the role of hypothesis and theory in scientific procedure."<sup>6</sup> For them "facts" were "detached from any hypothesis or interpretation"<sup>7</sup> and the important thing for the historian was to get the facts and to get them down. The "facts" once gathered and recorded would speak for themselves. In this sense this was a conception of pure, "scientific," inductive history.

The Turner school marks the appearance in historiography of the "appreciation of the role of hypothesis and theory in scientific procedure" noted above. It should never be forgotten that entirely apart from the virtues of his peculiar thesis, Turner was significant because "he was clear upon the role of interpretative hypothesis in historical investigation."<sup>8</sup>

This review requires that we discuss some of the cogent criticisms that may be leveled at the presuppositions of both schools, but only within the limits of our major purpose, which makes a trek through all the intricate problems involved in this concept of "objective" history, or through the morass of the Turner-anti-Turner argument unnecessary. First, however, we are concerned to note, at least for its symbolic value, that however he may or may not have been directly influenced, Professor Sweet did his Ph. D. work in history at the University of Pennsylvania during the ascendancy of McMaster, and at Chicago he inherited the mantle of Professor Peter Mode who was the most forthright exponent of the application of the Turner thesis to the interpretation of the history of Christianity in America.<sup>9</sup> The gist of my present contention is that Professor Sweet has always worn a Turner mantle rather lightly over a McMaster frame.

This juxtaposition of the two schools is not as surprising as it first may appear. McMaster has rightly been described as "the first national historian to appreciate the importance of the West. . . ."<sup>10</sup> and it is but a short step from such appreciation to acceptance of a ready-made thesis that seems to explain the importance. Indeed the step is so short that a man might easily stand with one foot in each school, and the supposition that Professor Sweet adopted this stance as he addressed himself to American Church history helps to clarify one's understanding of much of his work. Then when one realizes that although the step between the schools is short yet the gulf between them is very deep, amounting as suggested above to the division between two different conceptions of historiography, one is prepared to expect in the work of a historian who straddles the gap a certain dichotomous nature that can be confusing. When one examines some of Professor Sweet's work it would be very helpful to know whether he was standing on his McMaster or his Turner foot when he did it. In the present volume, as shall be noted below, he seems to stand largely on

the McMaster side, but to shift his weight to the Turner side for rather inclusive claims and assertions.

Now the Turner thesis, with which Professor Sweet early identified himself,<sup>11</sup> but which he frankly states he accepts only "with modifications",<sup>12</sup> has many ramifications of meaning and may be applied on many different levels. And insofar as it has meant to Professor Sweet only that the great western frontier posed many new and peculiar problems which made it the "testing ground," so that those churches which developed and used techniques most effectively to meet the situation became numerically largest and most evenly distributed geographically, and hence "most influential,"<sup>13</sup> we may say that he made it plausible and acceptable.

But in the present volume he explicitly enlarges the scope of the thesis in such fashion as to make the dichotomy mentioned above quite clear. In fact this work really has two distinct aspects: a superb straightforward objective presentation of the story with a broadly inclusive Turner or frontier thesis superimposed upon it. The rest of this review will be devoted largely to making this clear and to pointing out some of the general consequences for American Church historiography.

*Religion in the Development of American Culture 1765-1840* is volume II of Professor Sweet's projected four-volume *History of Religion in America*. Volume I, *Religion in Colonial America*, appeared in 1942. Volume III, presumably now in preparation, will cover the years from 1840 to 1880, taking as its major theme "controversy and division in both the nation and the churches" (p. x).

This volume is, first of all, a masterful and inclusive historical narrative of what happened in the religious scene during the years covered. The first two chapters deal in succession with the story of how the major denominations fared during the Revolution. The succeeding story is based upon the proposition that with the achievement of political independence the American churches were "confronted by three major tasks" (p. 96). The first was that of forming independent American organizations, the subject of chapter iii. The second was that of "reviving vital religion throughout the nation"—a perennial task and "one which is never finished."<sup>14</sup> The third was that of "following population westward with a revitalized Christianity to play its part in building a new society" in the West. The bulk of the book is devoted to the story of how the second and third tasks were accomplished, together with some interpretation of consequent results. Revivalism was the most effective technique for following the frontier and was common to practically all the Protestant groups (chap. iv). But Professor Sweet here more pointedly than in previous works places it in the context of the churches' awareness of their broader cultural vocation to help to build a sound individual morality and an orderly society

(chap. v). The part religion played in laying the cultural foundations of the nation is illustrated almost exclusively by an account of the founding of schools (chap. vi). The title of chapter vii, "The Revolt Against Calvinism," suggests the author's interpretation of the major theological trend of the period, and might be cogently criticized as distinctly less than inclusive. Chapter viii deals with the rise and development of the missionary movement, and chapter ix with "The Rise of Frontier Utopias."

Consideration of the work solely on this "McMaster" basis raises first the question of the periodization. It appears to be arbitrarily chronological. And because of Professor Sweet's emphasis the book really gets underway only with chapter iv—"Religion Follows the Frontier." Apparently 1840 is selected as the terminal point because the churches, having successfully met the three tasks imposed upon them, were on the verge of controversy and division. But there is little in the volume to prepare one to understand why this was the case, and actually divisions had already taken place in all the religious bodies and the controversy over slavery which was to cause the major splits was already well advanced.

Second, while a chronological pattern is followed through the first four chapters, which thus narrate a continuing development, the following five chapters are topical. And of them might be said what Theodore Roosevelt said of McMaster's second volume: "If all [the] . . . chapters were changed round promiscuously it would not, I am confident, injure the thread of his narrative in the least."<sup>15</sup> Further, there seems to be no clearer reason for breaking off the discussion of any of these five topics with 1840 than there is for including discussion of the churches during the Revolutionary war in this volume rather than in that dealing with the Colonial period. The result is that one is left with the feeling that the volume is without natural beginning or end.

Thus far we have considered the volume as if the author were standing only on his McMaster foot. At this point it becomes clear that when he formulated the periodization he had shifted to the Turner leg. In other words, the periodization is really based upon the general thesis that this was the "formative period in the history of the people of the United States" (p. 312) and their churches. "Formative" is a rather vague qualifying adjective, but presumably applied to a period it means that during this period the decisions were made and the patterns adopted that gave direction to the later developments. But this is open to grave objection when applied to the period in question. At least it could as well be argued that developmental lines were pretty well laid down by the end of the Revolution. For example, Mr. Trinterud has practically demonstrated (as the title given his study suggests) that in American Presbyterianism the decisive choices were



made and the conditioning forms established during the Colonial period.<sup>16</sup> And similarly, were not the Congregational, the Baptist, the Methodist, and Episcopalian systems quite well defined by the time the new nation took form? It seems to me that this could practically be demonstrated from Professor Sweet's own works.<sup>17</sup>

Hence the "formative period" thesis of this book hangs upon his adoption "with modifications, [of] the early Frederick Jackson Turner thesis that the 'moving frontier and its repercussions upon the nation as a whole should be the central theme in American history' at least for the span of years treated in this volume" (p. 313). There can be little quarrel with this contention. But Professor Sweet here goes on to amplify the thesis very specifically:

... the middle west was the first region in the United States to develop a character of its own, and the character there produced furnished the general pattern for the whole nation west of the Alleghenies. This was particularly true of organized religion. East of the mountains Old World patterns continued to persist; in the trans-Allegheny west new patterns emerged, and it was the success with which the several religious bodies functioned in the middle west that was to determine which of the American Churches were to be large and evenly distributed throughout the nation, and which of the Churches were to be typically American. The eastern churches which failed to make a major impact upon the middle west tended to remain small and sectional (p. 313).

And again:

... the religious bodies which met the problems of the west most adequately by developing new patterns were destined not only to be the largest but also the most typically American churches in the nation (p. 97).

The emphasis here is clearly placed upon the emergence and development of "new patterns." This, it is contended, was the "formative period" precisely because it was during this period that the "new patterns" emerged and were developed which were to determine for the churches their future size, distribution and character as "most typically American." My criticism is that this thesis is not explicitly documented in the volume by delineation of any "new patterns" and that, while it is superimposed upon the "objective" story so well woven around the three-major-tasks proposition noted above, it is not necessarily related to it.

If the above statement of the thesis with its crucial emphasis on "new patterns" be taken as the author's statement of what the book purports to be about, then it is fairly to be implied that the techniques and forms discussed in chapters iv through ix are examples of the "new patterns" that emerged during this period. Now the forms and events discussed are, for example, revivalism, the Plan of Union, the Baptist Farmer-Preacher and the Methodist Circuit-Rider systems, the founding of schools, the "revolt against Calvinism," the rise of missionary societies, and the rise of frontier utopias and experiments in "religious communitarianism." But it cannot be soundly argued that



any of these represented forms, techniques, or methods that were peculiar to the west, or were "new patterns" that emerged there. The possible exception might be the camp-meeting, granted the reasonably well documented statement on page 149 that "the first real camp-meeting dates from the year 1800 and was held in Logan County Kentucky."<sup>18</sup> But even this is qualified by the adjective "real." It would be difficult to maintain that the camp-meeting was entirely a "new pattern," and impossible to maintain that this one institution even if "new" determined the character and future development of any major religious body.

Professor Sweet in the past has called revivalism a frontier phenomenon,<sup>19</sup> and presumably this would be a fair implication of chapters iv and v of this book, if we were to take the above extended version of the thesis seriously. Hence it is interesting to note that he makes specific and somewhat extensive references to Whitney R. Cross's *The Burned-over District* (pp. 282-85) without calling attention to Cross's devastating and well documented contention that neither the revivals nor the ultraisms of the period took place in "frontier" areas. On the contrary, Cross indicates that the revivals and the "isms" really "coincided closely with Yankee derivation, social maturity, superior education, and at least average prosperity,"<sup>20</sup> and that "the only part of the Burned-over district which can fairly be called frontier after 1825. . . exhibited the most complete indifference to the religious and social excitements of the time."<sup>21</sup>

Further, it could be soundly argued on the basis of Professor Sweet's own work that revivalism was not a "new pattern" developed in the west, nor was the Methodist circuit-rider system, nor the Baptist Farmer-preacher method, nor "the revolt against Calvinism," nor the great missionary organizations originating during the period. The greatest surge of millennialism originated in New England (pp. 305-311). And while utopias and communismism thrived in the west, yet, with the questionable exception of Mormonism, what John Humphrey Noyes called "the male element in the production of them"<sup>22</sup>—the driving ideas—almost without exception originated east of the Alleghenies and most of them in Europe. As for Mormonism, Cross argues convincingly that the Palmyra region of New York was by no means a "frontier or cultural backwash" when the Smith family came there,<sup>23</sup> and it is notable that Mormonism "in the nineteenth century drew most of its converts not from its native America but from Europe."<sup>24</sup>

It seems a fair conclusion that Professor Sweet does not really document this form of the Turner or frontier thesis. And this is why its inclusion appears to be a superimposed assertion. Negatively one may conclude that if he does not document the thesis in a major work on this crucial period then it is not likely soon to be documented at all.

And one is led to suspect that intensive study of frontier religious forms similar to Benjamin F. Wright's study of "Political Institutions and the Frontier"<sup>25</sup> would lead to a similar conclusion: "... democracy did not come out of the American forest unless it was first carried there."

Further and more important for the future of American Church history, application of the frontier thesis even in the general form characteristic of Professor Sweet's other works,<sup>26</sup> conditions, channels, and limits the study in significant respects.

It is obvious that this thesis centers attention upon the period between the Revolution and the Civil War, and in such fashion as sometimes to obscure the continuity of American Church history. Within its perspective the Colonial period tends to be seen only as the period of transplanting and preparation. And succeeding periods are seen largely as the unfolding of elements already present—indeed, the period since the Civil War almost as anti-climax to the story. To be sure Professor Sweet composed a magnificent volume on *Religion in Colonial America*, but its informing spirit is that of McMaster rather than that of Turner.

In that volume a chapter is devoted to the rise of religious liberty and the separation of church and state in America. But this theme has not played the central part in his general interpretations that it might seem to deserve, and one may speculate that this is because the frontier thesis tends to distract attention from it.<sup>27</sup>

Next it should be noted that the emphases natural to the thesis have led to a relative neglect of the largest and fourth largest religious bodies in America, the Roman Catholic and the Lutheran. To the above statement<sup>28</sup> Professor Sweet adds,

I am, of course, leaving out of account the Roman Catholic and the newer Lutheran churches which arose as a result of nineteenth century immigration because neither were important factors during the early years of the last century. Both were to a large degree direct European transplantations, and neither was modified to any marked degree by frontier influences.

Without entering into the knotty problem of the Roman Catholic church in America, this approach certainly does less than justice to the interpretation of Lutheranism. Most Lutherans would no doubt be surprised to learn that their churches were largely "direct European transplantations" with the implication that they remained essentially unchanged in America. And insofar as the Lutheran immigrants moved on to the existing frontiers in the nineteenth century it would be reasonable to suppose, within the compass of the thesis, that what modifications took place<sup>29</sup> were somewhat at least the result of the "frontier influences."

Next one might note the easy tendency under the aegis of the thesis to equate numerical size and great geographical distribution with "typically American" and "most influential." To note only one out-

standing example illustrating the shortcomings of this interpretative tendency, one might look at Universalism. One of the smallest and least generally distributed groups, the Universalists have in important respects been influential out of all proportion to their size. For example studies indicate that the presence of Universalism on the frontier was a tremendously influential factor in shaping the theology and institutional pattern of all the other churches.<sup>30</sup> Further, in the context of Professor Sweet's own work, it might be noted that the relatively small Presbyterian churches took the leading part in the founding of schools and colleges, and that he points to this work as the prime example of religion's part in laying the foundations of American culture.

Lastly, the adequacy of the frontier thesis for the interpretation of the history of America since the decade 1870-1880 has long been subject to serious question. Professor Sweet and other "Turnerites" have been apt when dealing with this recent period to shift from a geographical to a sociological definition of "frontier," so as to include all culturally uprooted peoples for whatever reasons (e.g., the immigrants and other denizens of the new industrial urban centers) within the scope of the thesis.<sup>31</sup> This shift of definition is of course legitimate and perhaps points the way to a broader, more inclusive, and even more profitable "frontier thesis." Nevertheless, it changes the essential meaning and scope of the thesis, and consequently the whole methodological approach, and this also ought to be recognized.

Professor Sweet has adhered rather consistently in his works to the geographical definition of "frontier," perhaps because his major interest has been in the National period where this form has been particularly applicable and fruitful. But one consequence has been that his treatment of the period since the Civil War has not apparently been guided by any general thesis, with the result that it is not easy to reply to those who complain in effect that his discussion of this period consists of chronologically arranged "facts" illuminated only by his own profoundly Methodistic biases.

Mention of such personal biases leads naturally to consideration of the other major (or "McMaster") aspect of his history, which I think we must conclude provides the soundest foundation for his total work and really gives it its lasting quality.

Whatever may have been the direct "McMaster" influence on Professor Sweet's historiography he neither made any ostentatious display of nor claims for his own complete "objectivity." And in his refusal as a general rule to permit any graduate student working under his direction to write a dissertation on his own denomination some would see evidence of a suspicion of the pretension to such "objectivity" in himself or others.<sup>32</sup>

Yet there can be little doubt that "objectivity" has been the always

present ideal. Now the concept of "objectivity" takes on different meanings in different historiographical contexts and hence its particular meaning in any case is to be deduced from its expression in the historian's work. To Professor Sweet it has apparently meant, positively, comprehensiveness and inclusiveness. The "secular" historian becomes more "objective" as he includes religion in the purview of his work; the denominational historian as he includes consideration of "secular" forces and other religious groups. Hence, negatively, it has meant avoidance of denominational history written definitely from within the limiting boundaries of the group. Certainly it has been his ardent conscious wish to avoid denominational history in this narrow sense—to avoid, that is, what he was apt to call "patriotic history," or history written to make the members of a group "think well of themselves."<sup>33</sup>

And perhaps like the boy learning to ride a bicycle who seems irresistibly impelled toward what he most wishes to miss, the very intensity of Professor Sweet's desire in this respect propelled him into what he strove most to avoid. Be the explanation what it may, consideration of the total range of his work has led more than one serious student to the conclusion that all his history is shaped to the perspective of a great Methodist circuit. One can hardly escape the impression when he deals with the relative success of the churches on the "testing ground" of the frontier, and relates how some become largest, most evenly distributed, most typically American, and most influential, that the finger points to the Methodist Church as the one which most neatly fills the bill.<sup>34</sup>

It may be startling to suggest that one who made such conscious effort in the name of inclusive and "objective" church history to escape the pitfalls that had trapped previous and contemporary denominational historians thus poured all of American Church history into what looks suspiciously like a denominational mould. But the impression remains.

One is inclined on first thought to regard this phenomenon in psychological and individualistic terms, and to say that it suggests that Professor Sweet, like other exponents of the "objective" school, was betrayed by his personal history, which planted and nurtured in his very being biases that were too close to be recognized, and yet so obvious to the possessor that they were unconsciously projected to the horizon. In this single light it appears that the total span of his work amounts practically to a demonstration that it is about as hard for the historian of Christianity in America, by taking thought, to escape entanglement in the subtle relativities of his own denominational heritage as it is said to be for him by the same method to add a cubit to his stature. And one might round out this homily with the general moral that the beginning of wisdom for historians is the attempt to come to terms with these relativities.<sup>35</sup>

But on second thought it occurs to one that he cannot too easily dismiss the possibility that the Methodist is in fact the most influential and most typical American denomination—or at least that “Methodism” was the most influential, most typical, and most pervasive form of American Protestantism during the first quarter of the twentieth century when Professor Sweet’s historiography was shaped.

For “Methodism” may well be used to denominate one distinctive strand of the complex Protestant tradition in America. Broadly speaking, its roots are Arminian rather than Calvinist, it stresses the Christian life (largely in terms of conversion and individualistic morals) rather than institutions, doctrines, and sacraments, and it conceives of Christianity more as an evangelistic movement than as a “church.” Hence its predominant motif has been activism—an activism that flowered in many charitable, philanthropic and social works, projected, sponsored, and conducted by a host of committed and dedicated individuals who continually were being swept into the movement by the vast evangelistic and missionary program. Such a program and such works demanded organizational structures of equal complexity and bigness, and these were forthcoming. Hence “Methodism” has commonly been a highly structured movement organizationally, and might indeed be called a kind of non-churchly Christian institutionalism,<sup>36</sup> with an inherent tendency, as the central piety cools, for the institutional organization to take precedence.

In America “Methodism” so conceived has been most fully incarnated in the Methodist Churches, and their history illustrates most completely the genius and tendency of the movement. Down into the last quarter of the nineteenth century these churches glowed with a rampant revivalistic evangelicalism at the center, and their highly organized charitable and social works proliferated apace with the churches’ growth. Thereafter the revivalistic evangelicalism cooled rather rapidly into a respectable moralism still warmed but somewhat embarrassed by the embers of the earlier piety. No one has spoken more clearly than has Professor Sweet himself of the troubled hearts of many Methodists when they saw their church changing from “a living organism . . . more and more [into] a mere mechanism.”<sup>37</sup>

But even apart from the Methodist churches as such, it may be cogently argued that “Methodism” thus defined was the characteristic temper of the bulk of American Protestantism as late as twenty to thirty years ago. Since then strong counter currents of theology and church life have been flowing, albeit with greater strength in other major religious groups than among Methodists who seem now to confront them with some puzzlement.<sup>38</sup>



The point of all this is that "only yesterday" to hold the view that the Methodist was the most influential and most typical church in America was not necessarily just an exhibition of personal biases, but might be a rather incisive "objective" judgment based on sound and extensive knowledge. And if to many it no longer seems to be so, that is not necessarily just because they have different personal biases, but because of actual changes that have taken place in the churches themselves during the ensuing brief period.

Considered thus in the light of second thought, Professor Sweet's personal Methodist bias may be seen to reflect to a remarkable degree the objective realities of the situation he described. It is probably true that only one who was profoundly Methodist in personal bias could really exemplify in his outlook and record between the lines of his published works the essential nature of the American Protestantism of his generation. It is this that makes him something more than the mere narrator of "The Story of Religion in America"—namely, the spokesman for a generation of Protestantism. And herein his work is seen most clearly to partake of the quality of enduring greatness.

In this context the Turner or "frontier" thesis can be seen as almost incidental to the heart of Professor Sweet's work, and at most an interpretative tool, useful in constructing an explanation of how and why Methodism came to dominate American Protestantism but as readily laid aside and forgotten once the point was made. And thus it has been Professor Sweet's Methodism that transcended the dichotomous historiographical schools of McMaster and Turner, and made him the historian of more perhaps than he knew or intended.

Finally, the conclusions resulting from such an examination of Professor Sweet's total work as was proposed at the beginning of this review, may be cast into several propositions.

1. His work, despite everything that this and other present and future critics may say about it, exhibits a certain unmistakable historical genius that raises it above considerations of the author's personal biases and historiographical confusions. One may be sure that it will be read with profit after—and perhaps with greater profit long after—the shouting and tumult it presently occasions has died away. Genius is also exhibited in the sheer bulk of his publications in which the essential narrative is recorded. Upon this vast body of work lesser historians will feed for years to come, some of them without due acknowledgment. Indeed one might adapt for application to Professor Sweet what Michael Kraus said of McMaster: He has supplied "material for history" and

students of both greater and lesser maturity . . . have not hesitated to make good use of McMaster's bountiful offerings; beginning with John Fiske and



ending with the latest novice in an American history class, they have helped themselves generously.<sup>39</sup>

2. Professor Sweet's chief objective, which has defined his over-all intention, has been accomplished insofar as "secular" historians of America now generally recognize the important part religion has played in shaping the American civilization, and insofar as few church historians in seminaries would now propose to treat the history of their denomination without reference to secular forces and other denominations. This is a very important accomplishment.

3. He was essentially right in supposing from the beginning that "American Christianity cannot be judged by Old World criteria, for the New World demanded a new spirit as well as a new method."<sup>40</sup> This is to say that he was right in supposing that the history of Christianity in America cannot be comprehended simply by pouring it into the moulds of traditional Church history studies. A different interpretative approach was called for if that history was to be more than an embarrassing appendage to general Church history on the one hand or denominational monographs on the other.

4. His adaptation of the Turner thesis, insofar as it has meant only that those churches that most effectively used techniques to reach the moving frontier population grew largest over a larger geographical area, is sound. But insofar as it also adds that these churches have been most typically American and most influential it needs serious rethinking.

5. Insofar as his adaptation of the frontier thesis is made to include the emergence of "new patterns" in the west that defined a mid-west "character of its own" and "furnished the general pattern for the whole nation west of the Alleghenies," it must be said that this remains undocumented assertion, which seems to be superimposed upon his historical work but is not necessarily an inherent part of it.

6. Insofar as the thesis served as a liaison between "secular" American history and American Church history,<sup>41</sup> and insofar as it proved valuable in interpreting the National period and providing basic motivation for such a tremendous work as Professor Sweet's four volumes on *Religion on the American Frontier*, it served a very important purpose.

7. Insofar as application of the frontier thesis conditions, channels, and limits the study of American Church history as suggested above, it may be said to have been weighed and found wanting. It is unable to provide themes sufficiently inclusive and subtle to do justice to the complex history of Christianity in America.

8. Survey of Professor Sweet's total work suggests that the attempt to write American Church history "objectively" in what I

have called the "McMaster" sense is likely to leave one's history at the mercy of his inherent and unconscious personal biases and denominationalism, since he cannot so easily escape involvement in the relativities of his own personal history. And not many can be as fortunate as was Professor Sweet in having his personal biases coincide with the realities of his situation.

9. Therefore one concludes that any American Church history that is to rise above denominationalism<sup>42</sup> must be guided by some interpretative thesis that can transcend the practically ineradicable personal denominationalism of the author on the one hand, and the continually warring camps of the "secular" schools of historiography on the other.

10. Finally, Professor Sweet's work was conceived forthrightly as an attempt to orient American Church history to "secular" American history as then conceived in existing graduate departments. That conception was dominated by the "school" of McMaster and Turner, and Professor Sweet oriented his American Church history to both—with the somewhat confusing results indicated in this review.

However necessary it may have seemed a generation ago to pay such homage to the rather presumptuous occupants of university chairs of secular history in order to gain any scholarly recognition and respect at all for the history of religion, it is not necessary now—thanks in no small part to Professor Sweet's own work. Further, the attempt so to orient American Church history now clearly appears to the Church historian as the granting of too much initiative to the unpredictable and transient interpretative vagaries of so-called "secular" historians.

But more important, Church historians should sense that a whole scholarly "climate of opinion" is changing and, to quote Lincoln, "as our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew" in order to "rise with the occasion." The change is suggested by the fact that distinguished secular historians whose immediate predecessors at most tolerated it, now not only accept the study of Christianity but look to such study as the key to all their work.<sup>43</sup> It would indeed be one of the ironies of American Church history if, when this tendency is becoming obvious among secular historians, American Church historians should continue to pour their efforts into the mould of limiting and frustrating "secular" interpretative theses.<sup>44</sup>

Rather the historian of Christianity is in a stronger position than he has been for many years to reassert what he always should have maintained, that since "religion is the substance of culture and culture the form of religion,"<sup>45</sup> the center of the history of the West in general and of *all* aspects of American history in particular, is

the history of Christianity. To this saving insight perhaps we can go home again.

Therefore when Church historians see three outstanding "secular" historians girding themselves for "the task of telling the American story as a story of man in America"<sup>46</sup> they should see them unwittingly perhaps but nonetheless really as placing their feet on the road to religion. And their attitude, far from being that of ingratiating thankfulness that some "secular" historians now recognize that the history of religion may be a respectable scholarly pursuit, might rather be, that if these "secular" historians follow far enough the path they have perhaps unintentionally set their feet in, *their* history may eventually become full-blown and respectable in the profoundest sense.

Meanwhile Christian historians, adding the wisdom of the serpent to their more customary dove-like innocuousness (and they have equal authority for doing so), should keep the light burning in the window against the time of the wanderers' return.<sup>47</sup>

1. "Every Dog Has His Day," *The University of Chicago Magazine*, XXXIX (Feb., 1947), 11.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 10.

3. L. J. Trinterud, "Some Notes on Recent Periodical Literature on Colonial American Church History," *Church History*, XX (Dec., 1951), p. 73.

4. See e.g. Robert H. Nichols' review of *Religion in Colonial America* in *Church History*, XII (Mar., 1943), 65-67. Professor Nichols complains of the lack of treatment of religious thought and of a general "externality" with little "exposition of the inwardness, the spirit and genius of the forms of Christianity described. . . ."

5. Trinterud, *op. cit.*, p. 73.

6. J. H. Randall & George Haines, "Controlling Assumptions in the Practice of American Historians," *Theory and Practice in Historical Study . . .*, Bulletin 54, Social Science Research Council, 1946, p. 25.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 31.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 44.

9. See his *The Frontier Spirit in American Christianity*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1923.

10. William T. Hutchinson (ed.), *The Marcus W. Jernegan Essays in American Historiography*. Chicago: The Univ. of Chicago Press, 1937, p. 138. Also, Michael Kraus, *A History of American History*. New York: Farrar & Rinehart, Inc., 1937, pp. 390, 394.

11. *Circuit-Rider Days Along the Ohio*. New York: The Methodist Book Concern, 1923, p. 14: "By the middle of the eighteenth century a new society had been born in America, as well as a new section created. . . . This society differed greatly in all essentials

from the colonial society of the seaboard." This view is bolstered with a quotation from Turner which immediately follows. This thesis is not at all prominent in Professor Sweet's *Religion in Colonial America* published in 1942.

12. In the present volume he is especially critical of the tendency of the Turner historians to overemphasize "the economic motive" to the point of making themselves "economic determinists." See pages 160, 313, 314.

13. This form of the thesis is found throughout his works. See e.g., "The Frontier in American Christianity," in J. T. McNeill and others (eds.), *Environmental Factors in Christian History*. Chicago, Univ. of Chicago Press, 1939, pp. 390-91. *The American Churches, an Interpretation*. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1938, pp. 38-39. *American Culture and Religion*. Dallas: Southern Methodist Univ. Press, 1951, p. 64. "The Protestant Churches," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, vol. 256 (Mar., 1948), p. 46.

14. Professor Sweet has consistently followed those historians who have emphasized the irreligion and general religious deadness of the period immediately after the Revolution, as a background for the Revivals that began around 1795 (*Story of Religion in America*, 3rd ed., 1950, pp. 223-26). Yet when discussing "The Nationalization of the American Churches" he has correctly noted that this was the period of organization—" . . . a period of general constitution making, both within the states and in the ecclesiastical bodies" (*Ibid.*, p. 193),

and hence presumably a period of considerable initiative and vitality. In the present volume chapter iii ("Breaking Old World Ties: The Ordeal of Organization") really extensively documents the vitality of the churches as they faced and solved these problems. But chapter iv ("Religion Follows the Frontier") opens with a development of the idea that "organized religion [was] at low ebb" (pp. 91-96). The seeming inconsistency apparent in this dual interpretation of the same period is based upon Professor Sweet's typically "Methodistic" (see below) definition of and criteria for "religious deadness" or "religious vitality." It also suggests that extensive reappraisal of the period using more adequate definitions and criteria would lead to a more well-rounded and consistent picture of the churches' life at the time. The mode of such reappraisal and the results to be expected are suggested by two treatments of 18th century English church life: Norman Sykes, *Church and State in England in the XVIIIth Century* (Cambridge: University Press, 1934), and Edward W. Watson, *The Church of England* (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1944), chapter vii and following.

15. Quoted by Kraus, *History of American History*, p. 394.
16. L. J. Trinterud, *The Forming of an American Tradition, a Re-examination of Colonial Presbyterianism*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1949.
17. Referring particularly to *Religion in Colonial America and The Story of Religion in America*.
18. Compare the statement in *Environmental Factors . . .*, p. 386.
19. This is recalled from classroom lectures. See also *Environmental Factors . . .*, pp. 383-84.
20. Whitney R. Cross, *The Burned-over District: the social and intellectual history of enthusiastic religion in western New York*. Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 1950, p. 226.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 70.
22. *History of American Socialisms*. Philadelphia, 1870, p. 20. Noyes held that "the male element" was entirely of European origins.
23. Cross, *Burned-over District.*, p. 140.
24. H. Hamlin Cannon, "The English Mormons in America," *American Historical Review*, LVII (July 1952), p. 893. See also the same author's "Migration of English Mormons to America," in *op. cit.*, LII (April 1947), pp. 436-55.
25. In George Rogers Taylor (ed.), *The Turner Thesis Concerning the Role of the Frontier in American History*. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1949. The article was first published in Dixon Ryan Fox (ed.), *Sources of Culture in the Middle West*, 1934.
26. E. g., in *Environmental Factors . . .*, pp. 390-91: "The frontier was to prove the testing-ground where it was to be determined which among the American churches were to become the most numerous and influential as well as the most typically American religious bodies. . . . It is a significant fact that neither of the churches which were established by law during the Colonial period—the Congregationalists in New England and the Episcopalians in the colonies south of Pennsylvania—succeeded in maintaining their positions of leadership as population pushed westward, and both churches have remained relatively small bodies. Neither of these bodies developed any adequate method of following population westward. On the other hand, those churches which succeeded in finding an adequate technique in dealing with restless and moving populations in the early West were those churches which became the most evenly distributed as well as the most numerous religious bodies in America." And see note 13 above for references to other statements.
27. Professor Sweet has recognized religious freedom as perhaps the most important and significant thing in the religious history of America. Nevertheless, except insofar as it is assumed throughout as an essential part of the background, the principle does not play a leading role in his interpretations. I am suggesting that the frontier thesis, by centering attention upon the National as the "formative" period, tends to a slighting of the formative influence of the struggles for religious liberty that preceded. If one considers *Religion in Colonial America* and the present volume as a unit, the rise of religious liberty is seen as one culminating point of the Colonial period but not necessarily central to it.
28. That is, the statement quoted in note No. 26.
29. In a later work (*The American Churches*, pp. 135-36) there are indications that Professor Sweet had modified his earlier views somewhat. There he recognizes that "While all of the American Lutheran churches have maintained their European character and theological emphasis to a greater degree than any other large Protestant body, they have, however, been greatly influenced in their forms of church government by their American environment. The Scandinavian Lutheran bodies, for instance, did not transplant their Old-World episcopal systems, but have developed here a Congregational-Presbyterian type of polity, in which the laity have an important part. The same is true of the conservative Lutheran churches of German background." The tendency here to minimize the significance of changes in "forms of church government" seems strangely

inconsistent with the general significance given to "forms" and "patterns" when dealing with other groups. And the emphasis placed upon the maintenance of "European character and theological emphasis" would seem to slight the extensive development of independent "pietistic" or "Haugean" Lutheran churches in America. Two recent Ph.D. dissertations at the University of Chicago throw much light on these matters: Eugene L. Fevold, "The History of Norwegian-American Lutheranism 1870-1890" (1951), and Paul C. E. Nyholm, "The Americanization of the Danish-Lutheran Churches," (1952).

30. It is indicated, for example, that the revivalistic work and the theology of Charles G. Finney was conceived and shaped in important respects by Finney's attempts to meet the claims and inroads of the Universalists (William C. Walzer, "Charles Grandison Finney and the Presbyterian Revivals of Central and Western New York," (Ph.D. thesis, Univ. of Chicago, 1944)). Unitarianism has likewise exerted a similar important role in shaping the other Protestant groups.

31. See, for example, Professor Sweet's comment in *Environmental Factors*. . . , p. 383, n.12; and in *The Annals*. . . , p. 46.

32. In spite of this restriction placed upon students, he did permit himself the privilege of a general history of his own denomination (*Methodism in American History*. New York: The Methodist Book Concern, 1933), which he rightly looked back upon as playing a significant part in effecting Methodist unification precisely because "all controversial issues were treated objectively" since "the author had no side to defend, no party to uphold" and hence had as the object, only "to tell the whole truth without fear or favor and with full appreciation of all the differing viewpoints" (*American Culture and Religion*, p. 76).

33. *American Culture and Religion*, p. 4. For Professor Sweet's general conception of "objectivity" or "historical-mindedness" see this work, pp. 73-76.

34. Sometimes the finger becomes almost tangible, e.g., "The Methodists . . . seemed ideally suited to meet the immediate needs of a moving and restless population" (*Environmental Factors*. . . , p. 393). And see also, *The American Churches*, pp. 41-48.

35. As expounded, for example, by H. Richard Niebuhr, *The Meaning of Revelation*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1946. Chap. 1.

36. The definition of Christianity in these general terms underlies and pervades all of Professor Sweet's work. But see,

for example, *The Annals*. . . , p. 44: "The left-wing emphasis on religion as a way of life rather than the emphasis on creed became and remains the common man's pattern of Christianity in America." And again, *The American Churches*, p. 81: "The concept of the church which has come to prevail in American Protestantism is that of a voluntary society, and not of an authoritarian institution tied to the state. Its sacraments are means of grace rather than symbols of historic confessions."

37. *Methodism in American History*, p. 335.

38. See, for example, Professor Sweet's comments on "the crisis theology" or "pessimistic philosophy" in *The American Churches*, pp. 138-39; and in *The Story of Religion in America* (3rd ed., 1950), pp. 450-51. For a suggestion of the larger context, see e.g. article by C. Stanley Lowell, "Let's Bury the Corpse" in *The Pastor*, XVI (Sept. 1952), 3-4, together with letters and articles in commendation or reply in subsequent issues. For one example of how Professor Sweet's "Methodism" has conditioned his interpretation, see Note 14 above.

39. *History of American History*, p. 394.

40. *Environmental Factors*. . . , p. 397.

41. But one suspects that the "secular" historians have been more impressed and influenced by the "McMaster" aspect of his work.

42. "Denominationalism" as so well delineated by Professor Wilhelm Pauck, "Theology in the Life of Contemporary American Protestantism," *The Shalom Quarterly*, XIII (April, 1952), 33-50.

43. I refer, for example, to the work of such men as R. G. Collingwood, and Herbert Butterfield in England, and to George Stephenson's *The Puritan Heritage* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1952), in which see the "Epilogue." For a summary of these, and similar developments, see E. Harris Harbison, "The 'Meaning of History' and the 'Writing of History,'" *Church History*, XXI (June, 1952), 97-107.

44. "Limiting and frustrating" for Christian historians precisely because, as James H. Nichols has put it, "positivist history must be secular history" "The Art of Church History," *Church History*, XX (Mar., 1951), p. 6.

45. In Paul Tillich, *The Protestant Era*, Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1948. p. 57.

46. Ray A. Billington, B. J. Loewenberg, and S. H. Brockunier, *The United States; American Democracy in World Perspective*. New York: Rinehart and Company, 1947. Preface.

47. I have argued elsewhere that "The Task of the Church Historian" is to be "an evangelist" (*The Chronicle*, XII (July, 1949), 127-43).

# AN INVENTORY OF CURRENT RESEARCH IN MISSIONS IN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA

R. PIERCE BEAVER

MISSIONARY RESEARCH LIBRARY

An inventory of research projects in progress in the field of Missions reveals a marked reversal of the long prevailing trend towards studies concerned with strategy and tactics, with methods and techniques, and with area surveys. History holds the center of interest at this moment. Fully half of the projects reported by the foreign mission boards and by the professors of missions are of a historical nature and numbers of others are closely related and require an historical approach. An unusually large number of mission boards report research studies, but, unfortunately, the great majority of boards and of professors

of missions are not engaged in any project at this time. Chairs of Missions in the theological seminaries divide roughly into two classes, those regarded as belonging to the field of history and those belonging to the practical field. Considerably more research is being done among those teachers whose orientation is historical than by those whose interest is chiefly practical. The following projects have been reported to the Missionary Research Library. They do not include theses. The Missionary Research Library has collected data and issued a report in each of the past three years on "Theses in Missions and Related Subjects."

## I. THE HISTORICAL FIELD

### Biography

1. South Africa General Mission, *Fervent in Spirit*, a biography of the Reverend Arthur J. Bowen, secretary of the South Africa General Mission in the United States for thirty-five years.
2. Prof. John R. Weinlich, Moravian Theological Seminary, Bethlehem, Pa., *Life of Zinzendorf*. To be completed in 1954.
3. Dr. W. Reginald Wheeler, *Biography of Robert E. Speer*, A project of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.; to be completed by May 1, 1954.
4. Prof. Charles W. Carter, Marion College, *The Universal Christian Mission*.
5. Prof. J. C. Thiessen, Detroit Bible Institute, *History of Missions*. To be published in 1953.
6. American Bible Society, *Book of a Thousand Tongues*. A revised and enlarged edition of a 1938 publication, giving account of the translation and publication of the Scriptures in the various languages of the world; to be published in 1954.
7. American Bible Society and the British and Foreign Bible Society, *Historical Catalogue of Printed Scriptures*, Vol. I. A joint undertaking of the two Bible Societies in a revision and enlargement of a standard work originally published by the B. and F. Bible Society.
8. Dr. Wade Crawford Barclay, *History of*

*Methodist Missions*, Vol. III. A project of the Board of Missions and Church Extension, Methodist Church.

9. Dr. R. V. DeLong, *Fifty Years of Nazarene Missions*, Vol. II.
10. Prof. H. C. Goerner, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky., *A Short History of Baptist Missions*.
11. Dr. Fred Field Goodsell, *History of the American Board*. An official project of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions.
12. Prof. Kenneth Scott Latourette, Yale Divinity School, *History of the World Service of the Y.M.C.A.'s of the United States and Canada*. A project of the National Councils of Y.M.C.A.'s.
13. Dr. Frank K. Means, *History of Southern Baptist Foreign Missions*. A project of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Southern Baptist Convention.
14. Prof. D. E. Rebok, Secretary of the General Conference, Seventh-Day Adventist Church, *Missions of the Seventh-Day Adventist Church*. Will be published in 1954.
15. Women's Home and Foreign Missionary Society of the Advent Christian Denomination, *History of the Society*. To be published in 1954.
16. D. J. R. Wilson, in charge, *History of the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society and Women's American Baptist Foreign Mission Society*.
17. Mr. E. C. Woodley, *History of the British and Foreign Bible Society in Canada*. A project of the Society, to be completed early in 1953.



*American Home Missions*

18. Prof. L. A. Brown, Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary, Berkeley, Cal., *Sunset Missions*. The story of missions in the far west of the U. S. A.
19. Prof. Herbert C. Jackson, Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Pa., *History of the American Baptist Home Missions During the Formative Years*. Treating the period when Dr. Henry L. Morehouse was executive secretary; to be completed late in 1952.
20. Prof. Harold L. McManus, Mercer University, *The Activity of the American Baptist Home Missions Society in the Education of Freedmen in Georgia, 1862-1897*. Will be completed in 1952, and then will be followed by similar studies of other Southern states.
21. *Mennonite Outreach Study*. A study to ascertain how much the Church has grown during the past decades, where the growth has occurred, among what kind and classes of people, etc.; reported by the Mennonite Board of Missions and Charities.

*Histories of Field Missions*

22. Prof. James E. Bear, Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va., *History of the Brazil Mission of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A* project of the Board of World Missions, Presbyterian Church in the U. S.
23. The Rev. F. W. Brandauer, *History of the Central China Mission of the Evangelical United Brethren Church*.
24. Senator Brooks of the Union of South Africa, *History of Adams College*, an important institution of the American Zulu Mission, American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions.
25. Dr. A. V. Casselman, Secretary Emeritus, Board of International Missions, Evangelical and Reformed Church, *History of the China Mission of the Evangelical and Reformed Church*. Completed but not yet published.
26. Dr. Hugh A. Macmillan, *History of the Canadian Presbyterian Mission in Formosa*.
27. The Rev. Russell E. Nilson, Hongkong, *A History of the Lutheran church in China*. Reported by Board of Foreign Missions, Augustana Lutheran Church.
28. Dr. J. F. Preston, Sr., *History of the Korean Mission of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A* project of the Board of World Missions, Presbyterian Church in the U. S.
29. Miss Ethel T. Wharton, *Led in Triumph*, a history of the Congo Mission of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A project of the Board of World Missions; to be published in 1952.
30. Miss Eleanor Wilson, *History of Missions in the Micronesian Islands*. Particularly the story of American Board missions and the ship *Morning Star*.

*Other Historical Studies*

31. Prof. M. S. Bates, Union Theological

Seminary, *Religious Liberty in the Post-War Era*. To be completed in 1954 or 1955.

32. Dr. R. Pierce Beaver, Missionary Research Library, *St. Augustine as Missionary*.
33. To be completed 1953. Also, *The Faith Missions*. To be completed 1953.
34. Prof. Roger S. Gupill, Gammon Theological Seminary, Atlanta, Ga., *Early Work of the American Colonization Society*.
35. Prof. Armas K. E. Holmio, Suomi College, *Medieval History of the Church of Finland*.
36. Prof. Kenneth Scott Latourette, Yale Divinity School, *A History of Christianity*. To be published in 1953.
37. Prof. Rudolph A. Renfer, Dallas Theological Seminary, *Protestant Integration*, reflecting corporate trends in American History. To be completed in 1952.
38. President Henry P. Van Dusen, Union Theological Seminary, *Christian Missions and Christian Unity*. An enlargement of his Cody Lectures given at Toronto in November, 1952; to be published in 1953.

*Directories, Gazetteers, Handbooks*

39. Dr. R. Pierce Beaver, Missionary Library, *North American Handbook of Foreign Missions Agencies*. To be published early in 1953.
40. Dr. E. E. Grice, *Foreign Missions Handbook of the United Presbyterian Church in N. A.* A reference work on the fields and stations of the U. P. Church abroad; a project of the Board of Foreign Missions. To be completed in January, 1953.
41. Miss Barbara Lewis, *Methodist Overseas Missions, Gazetteer and Statistics*. A revision of a standard Methodist work last published in 1948; a project of the Board of Missions and Church Extension of the Methodist Church; to be published in 1953.

*Indexing and Microfilming of Archives*

42. American Bible Society, *A project including the entire archives*.
43. Dr. Charles E. Corbett, in charge of the project: *entire archives of the United Board of Christian Colleges in China*.
44. Dr. J. Leon Hooper, in charge of the project: *Early Correspondence with the Foreign Fields*, Board of Foreign Missions, Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.

## II. PRINCIPLES OF MISSIONS

45. Board of Foreign Missions, Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., Study Committee, Dr. Henry P. VanDusen, Chairman, *The Missionary Obligation of the Church*. To be completed late 1952.
46. Prof. Wilbur C. Harr, Evangelical Theological Seminary, Naperville, Illinois, *Theory for the Practice of Missions*. To be completed in 1953.

47. Prof. Harold Lindsell, Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, California, *Missionary Principles and Practices*. A textbook; to be completed in 1953 or 1954.
48. Committee on Research in Foreign Missions, National Council of Churches of Christ in the U. S. A., Study Group on the Theological Basis of the Mission: having completed a document for use at the Willingen Conference of International Missionary Council, this Study Group began a new series of studies in November 1952. Papers will be issued from time to time.
49. Synod of the Christian Reformed Church, a Committee, *Principles of Missions*. The first part of this Committee's report has been printed in *Acts of Synod*, 1952, and a second part will be presented to the Synod in June, 1953.

### III. MISSIONS AND CULTURES

#### *Anthropology and Culture*

50. Prof. Eddy Asirvatham, Boston University School of Theology, *Christianity in the Indian Crucible*. To be completed late in 1952.
51. Christian and Missionary Alliance, *Primitive Language Studies in New Guinea and Indo-China*.
52. Prof. George A. Dunger, North American Baptist Seminary, Sioux Falls, South Dakota, *Religious Beliefs and Practices of Some Cameroons Tribes*. and
53. *The Dynamics of Religious Experience of the Northwestern Bantu as Illustrated by the Bakweri*. Both completed but not yet published.
54. Prof. Leonard Gittings, Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, Chicago, *Religion and Practices of the Bantu Tribes of the Congo, and Changes in*
56. *Congo Life in the Last Twenty-five Years*. Both to be completed in 1953.
56. Dr. Glenn P. Reed, *Policies of Mission Boards in Africa with Respect to Church Membership and Plural Marriage*. Project of the Board of Foreign Missions of the United Presbyterian Church in N. A.
57. Miss Dorothy Walker, a missionary of the Gospel Missionary Union, *Study of the Culture of the Jivaro Indians of Eastern Ecuador*.

#### *Religions*

58. Prof. Archibald G. Adams, Temple University School of Religion, Philadelphia, Pa. *Christianity's Debt to the Oriental Religions*.
59. Prof. Murray T. Titus, Westminster Theological Seminary, Westminster, Md., *Islam in India and Pakistan*. A revision of his earlier book, *Indian Islam*.

### IV. AREA SURVEYS

60. Prof. L. A. Brown, Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary, Berkeley, Calif., *Survey of Foreign Language Groups on the West Coast*.

61. The Rev. James A. Johnson, *Africa, Especially Southern Rhodesia*. A project of the American Advent Mission.
62. The Rev. Brian Kingslake, *Christian Missions in Orange Free State and Transvaal*. A project of the Board of Missions of the Church of the New Jerusalem.
63. Dr. Ira W. Moomaw, *Report on Rural Missions in India and Pakistan*. A project of Agricultural Missions, Inc.

### V. ADMINISTRATIVE RESEARCH

64. Board for Christian Work in Santo Domingo, Field research by a commission, to bring in recommendations for future program.
65. Board of Foreign Missions, Brethren in Christ Church, *Education of Missionaries' Children, and Terms of Service and Furlough Periods*.
67. Board of Foreign Missions, Reformed Church in America; Board of Foreign Missions of the United Presbyterian Church, and Women's General Missionary Society of the United Presbyterian Church; a joint study, *Missionary Organization and Methods in Certain Areas of Belgian Congo and Uganda*.
68. Board of Missions, Presbyterian Church in Canada, *Intensive Study of the Mission at Jhansi, Central India*. For determination of future policy.
69. Christian Missions, Inc., A study looking forward to the establishment of new stations and institutions in Africa, and a study preparatory to opening a new field in French Guiana.
71. Committee on Research in Foreign Missions, National Council of Churches, *The Turnover of Missionary Personnel*.
72. Conservative Baptist Foreign Missions Society, *The Indigenous Approach in Foreign Missions Work*.
73. Foreign Missions Commission, Church of the Brethren, *Strategy of Missions in the Church of the Brethren*. To be completed in 1954.
74. Dr. Ralph P. Hanson, *A Survey of Budgetary Policies of Denominational Boards Relating to the Advantages and Disadvantages of the Unified Budget*.
75. The Rev. W. P. Mills, *Income Tax and the Foreign Missionary*, a project of the Committee on Research in Foreign Missions, National Council of Churches; to be published late in 1952. And also *Forms of Inter-board Cooperation*, a project of the Committee on Research *Candidate Handbook*. To be published early in 1953.
77. Missionary Society of the Church of England in Canada, *A Critical Study of the Development and Progress of the Work of the Society*.

### VI. CANDIDATE TRAINING

78. Dr. R. Pierce Beaver, Missionary Research Library, *The Missionary and His Reading*. To be completed in 1953.
79. Dr. Paul G. Culley, Columbia Bible College, Columbia, S. C., *Curriculum Studies for Missionary Candidate Training*.

80. Far Eastern Gospel Crusade, *Crusade Candidate Handbook*. To be published in June, 1953.

#### VII. MISSION STUDY BOOKS

Each year the Joint Commission on Missionary Education of the National Council of Churches (formerly the Missionary Education Movement) announces a mission study emphasis for Home Missions and another for Foreign Missions and publishes books on these subjects for all ages and for use in most North American Churches and their mission study groups. The themes for next year vary a little from the pattern. The major theme for 1953-1954 will be "The Life and Task of the Church Around the World." There will be a secondary theme of a Home Missions nature, "Spanish Speaking Americans." In 1954-1955 the Home Missions theme will be "The City," and the Foreign Missions Theme is to be "India, Pakistan, and

Ceylon." The authors of the adult books, with the exception of "The City":

81. The Rev. Charles W. Ranson, General Secretary of the International Missionary Council, *That the World May Know*. The adult study book on the major theme in 1953-1954; to be published in spring, 1953.
82. Dr. John Scottford, *Our Spanish Speaking Americans*. The adult study book for the second theme for 1953-1954; to be published in spring, 1953.
83. Bishop Stephen Neill, the adult study book on *India* for 1954-1955; to be published in the spring of 1954.
84. The Southern Baptist Convention produces its own major mission study books. The theme for 1953-1954 is "Brazil" and Mr. Everett Gill, Jr., is preparing the adult study book, to be completed by July, 1953. The theme for the following year will be "Moslem Areas of the Near East."

#### VIII. MISCELLANEOUS

85. Prof. Armas K. E. Holmio, Suomi College, *Mission Prayers Used in the Christian Churches of the World*. To be completed in 1952.

## BOOK REVIEWS

*Christian Egypt: Church and People. Christianity and Nationalism in the Patriarchate of Alexandria.* By EDWARD ROCHIE HARDY. New York, Oxford University Press, 1952. IX+241 pages. \$3.50.

This is an admirable and inspiring book. Yet it will not replace the famous *History of the Patriarchate of Alexandria* by John Mason Neale, much out of date as the latter certainly is, since Dr. Hardy does not pretend to cover the whole field, but confines his attention to one particular issue: "the rise in Egypt of a national form of Christianity," i.e. of the Coptic Church. In spite of this self-imposed limitation many paragraphs in the book are not immediately related to the main topic, which increases the interest and the value of the study. Chapter I is a masterly sketch of early Christianity in Egypt, "in the age of the Martyrs," up to St. Athanasius. One might regret that Dr. Hardy did not use the recent study, the *Life of St. Anthony* by P. Louis Bouyer (Editions de Fontenelle, Abbaye S. Wandrille, 1950), probably the best on the subject, and was not acquainted with the stimulating monograph on Anatolius of Laodicea by P. Demetrius Lebedeff (Petrograd 1916). In any case more evidence would be required to support Dr. Hardy's contention that *anachoresis* in Egypt was primarily "a means of protest and escape" (36), although the social motivation and implications of monasticism are obvious, but probably in another sense, at least in the IVth century. Monastic colonization of the Desert was an attempt to build "another City," rival and parallel to the "Christian Empire." The Coptic background of the Meletian schism (53) is an interesting and highly plausible suggestion. The chapter on St. Athanasius makes interesting reading and contains valuable suggestions. Much more could be said on his conception

of the Church in her relation to the State; cf. the recent essay by Professor Williams in this magazine. Further study will be required in order to state clearly the relations of local complications to Imperial policy in the "tragedy of Athanasius." One could have quoted the valuable comments of Bishop K. Kirk on St. Pachomius and his community (in *The Vision of God*, p. 258 ff.). The treatment of Shenute is obviously too brief (101-103). To what extent was this hardening of the discipline into a "prison-system" Coptic? Or was it rather just the personal approach of a totalitarian abba? On the whole it seems that tensions between Alexandria and Constantinople were due not only to the local national resistance, but primarily to the rivalry of the Patriarchal thrones, since the Hellenic Archbishops were no less in conflict with the Ecumenical See than those who could be regarded as spokesmen for a national Egypt. Nor should it be forgotten that Rome was involved in the competition. It may be perfectly true that "the Copts were not particularly interested in the delicate distinctions of Greek theology" (114). Yet the problem of Monophysitism is first of all a problem of religious experience and psychology and the mass-resistance to Chalcedon was inspired less by purely theological scruples than by the obstinacy of an un-theological spirituality. It may be said that a "Monophysite Christ" was a suitable Redeemer for an ecstatic and visionary monk, as the "Nestorian Christ" was a Saviour for the Pelagian man. It would be of help if one should apply to the study of the Monophysite strife the method of "Motivforskning," promoted by the school of Lund and vindicated by its achievements in several fields of research. What seems to be an unnecessary disputation about terms and concepts, appears much more serious and profound when studied in the perspective of spiritual experience and aspirations. In any case Monophysit-

ism has become the religion of the Copts not only for historical and political reasons. The first volume of the monumental collective work on the Council of Chalcedon, edited by A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht (*Das Konzil von Chalkedon, Geschichte und Gegenwart*, Bd. I, *Der Glaube von Chalkedon*, Echter-Verlag, Würzburg, 1951) appeared too late to be used by Dr. Hardy. It must be added now to his general Bibliography. Two other books could have helped Dr. Hardy in his interpretation of the Egyptian development taken as an example of a "National Christianity." P. Gustave Bardy collected an enormous material on a cognate topic in his book: *La Question des langues dans l'Eglise Ancienne*, t. I, Paris 1948; he has some illuminating pages on Egypt (p. 38-52). The late P. Paul Peeters approaches the same topic from another point of view in his posthumously published volume: *Le Trefonds oriental de l'Hagiographie Byzantine*, Bruxelles 1950 (*Subsidia Hagiographica* 26); note the chapter on Egypt, p. 27-48. Dr. Hardy's final statement contending that "unless nationally indigenous, the Church cannot survive" (201) obviously should have been more elaborated. This historian cannot escape the conviction that as far as his knowledge goes all "nationalisms" throughout the ages have been a disruptive and divisive factor in Christendom, obscuring the universality and the truth of the Christian message. One should add to Dr. Hardy's general Bibliography an important essay by Dr. Dvornik, *National Churches and the Church Universal* (originally in the *Eastern Churches Quarterly*, vol. V, 1943, and then in a separate edition, Dacre Press, Westminster). In spite of all these reservations and cautions one must heartily recommend Dr. Hardy's book to all students of Ancient Church History and to all who would look in the experience of the past for guidance in the controversies or troubles of the present.

GEORGES FLOROVSKY.

Columbia University and  
Union Theological Seminary

*Contemporary Ethiopia*. By DAVID A. TALBOT. New York: Philosophical Library. 1952. xxi+267 pages.

*Islam in Ethiopia*. By J. SPENCER TRIMMINGHAM. London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, 1952. iv+299 pages.

Those who are interested in the Coptic Church in Ethiopia will find these two books useful. *Contemporary Ethiopia* is a sketchy but interesting book dealing with various aspects of modern Ethiopia—agriculture, education, defense and so on. Chapter 17, "The Ethiopian Church" gives a brief account of the struggle of the Coptic Church under Italian invasion in the 1930's and of the negotiation since 1942 between the Ethiopian Church and her mother church in Cairo.

*Islam in Ethiopia* is an important work by an eminent Islamic scholar. Dr. Trimmingham aims to study the history and institutions of the Islamic peoples of north-east Africa. Students of Church History will find this book very valuable because the Christian state of Ethiopia has for centuries been surrounded by Islamic peoples. In the Islamic world, religion and culture are expected to be inseparably intertwined. However, in Ethiopia, which was exposed to Christianity even before the rise of Islam, a threefold interaction of Christianity, paganism, and Islam has continued to this day.

The unique features of Ethiopia are described by Prof. Toynbee as follows: "the survival of her political independence in the midst of an Africa under European dominion; the survival of her Monophysite Christianity in the borderland between Islam and paganism; the survival of her Semitic language between the Hamitic and Nilotic language areas; and the stagnation of her culture at a level which is really not much higher than the level of the adjacent Tropical African Barbarism." (Quoted by Trimmingham on p. 143). The author attempts to find answers to these questions throughout the book, but more specifically in the chapter on "The Conflict of Christianity and Islam in Ethiopia" (pp. 32-146).

The answers given by Trimmingham may be stated as follows: (1) A most important factor in the survival of Ethiopia was the Solomonic legends and tradition, which gave a common foundation, not only consolidating the monarchy but giving a sense of racial superiority. (2) This Ethiopian pride of race was, after the sixteenth century, to hinder the effective propagation of Christianity. (3) The Islamic threat has been less serious than that of the Galla hordes and Western imperialism, and Islam has gained little through actual conquest; in its peaceful penetration in the region, Islamic gain has been chiefly from paganism rather than from Christianity. (4) In the conflict between Islam and Christianity it has been more a matter of one racial and cultural tradition against another than of one faith against another. (pp. 143-146.)

The chapter on "Special Characteristics of Islam in the Region" (pp. 225-281) is also very important. It is to be noted that the Ethiopian Muslims (Jabarti) and the Ethiopian Christians are of the same physical type, speak the same language, and live in the same environment; furthermore, they show no fanatical bias against transition from one religious system to another. Inevitably, there has been mutual influence between Christians and Muslims. Also, the impact of Western civilization has been felt among all the religious groups in Ethiopia in the recent years.

This book has excellent references and maps. It is well organized and documented. Undoubtedly, Dr. Trimmingham's research will be deeply appreciated by church historians as well as by historians of religions.

JOSEPH M. KITAGAWA

*Federated Theological Faculty  
University of Chicago*

---

*The Lost Churches of China.* By  
LEONARD M. OUTERBRIDGE. Phila-  
delphia: The Westminster Press,  
1952. 237 pages. \$3.50.

At one time a missionary in China, Dr. Outerbridge is deeply concerned over the present reverses which Christianity is suffering in that land. He is eager to ascertain the reasons for its lack of greater success. Believing that China will again be accessible to Christian missionaries, he wishes the Church in the Occident so to have learned from past mistakes that they may be wiser in the future. To this end he has reviewed the history of Christianity in China from its first introduction in 635 to the present, seeking to ascertain the causes for its complete disappearance after its coming in the seventh and again in the thirteenth century, for its weakness, notably in the eighteenth century after its third introduction in the sixteenth century, for its losses from the Boxer outbreak in 1900, and for its seeming failure to stand up better against the Communist onslaught in our own day. To this end he had read diligently in much of the pertinent literature.

Among the causes which the author believes that he has discovered are the employment by missionaries of political force to gain their ends, the identification of Christianity with Western civilization, and, above all, the neglect or refusal, with rare exceptions, to appreciate the spiritual values in China's religious heritage and the lack of "adequate effort to relate the Christian faith to the highest aspirations of China's religious thought." The book is well written and provocative.

The book is so good that the experts will be annoyed that it is no better. Here and there are mistakes of fact. More frequent are generalizations often put forth dogmatically, which the specialists will question. Moreover, the author has not always been sufficiently critical in his appraisal of the literature on which he has relied and has given credence to some works which ought to have been used only with great care. In general, however, the books and articles upon which dependence is had are excellent.

The present reviewer finds himself wondering whether the author has



correctly appraised the history of the reverses which have been suffered by Christianity in China. For instance, he is not at all persuaded that the decline in the eighteenth century was due chiefly to the methods of the missionaries of that period. It seems to him that far more important were such factors as the failure of the churches of the West to send more missionaries and especially adverse political conditions in China which would have worked against Christianity regardless of what means the missionaries employed. When one comes to the ordeal through which Christianity in China is passing at the present, it is extremely doubtful that it could have been appreciably lightened and the status of Christianity made less insecure had missionaries adopted the procedures which Dr. Outerbridge so persuasively advocates. For example, had the majority of missionaries sought to relate their message more sympathetically to Confucianism or Buddhism, Christianity would have fared even worse than it has. Attempts by such great souls as Timothy Richard, Gilbert Reid, and K. L. Reichelt to do so did not root Christianity as deeply as did some by men who were quite uncompromising toward the systems which preceded that faith in China. We must remember, too, that an important factor in retarding the spread of Christianity in recent years was the Japanese invasion, first in Manchuria and then over those parts of China proper where Christianity was numerically the strongest. Moreover, Communists have been directing their blows against all religions in China, including Confucianism. That they have paid so much attention to the Church is evidence of its strength. Had Christianity allied itself with Confucianism it would have been still more handicapped, for that element in Chinese life, so recently dominant, has been rapidly waning, more from other causes than the criticism of Christian missionaries, and Communists are intent upon completing its eradication from Chinese life.

K. S. LATOURETTE

Yale University

*Christian Influence Upon the Ideology of the Taiping Rebellion, 1851-1864.* By EUGENE POWERS BOARDMAN. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1952. viii, 188 pages.

Students of Church History will be indebted to Dr. Boardman for his thorough treatment of the Taiping Rebellion, one of the greatest uprisings of Chinese history. The Taiping Rebellion has been regarded as a prototype of Sun Yat-sen's revolution of 1911, and has been, in more recent years, described uncritically as a part of the revolutionary heritage of the Chinese Communists.

"The Taiping Rebellion grew out of a situation compounded of dynastic decline, agrarian distress, overpopulation, foreign penetration, failure to provide an adequate officialdom, and Chinese resentment against the misrule of alien Manchu overlords" (p. 9). Already in the Anglo-Chinese War (1839-42) the military reputation of the Manchu government was discredited, and in the south the so-called "Triad Society" or the three anti-Manchu secret societies were in open rebellion. The Taiping rebels celebrated their initial victory over the imperialist forces in 1851, but they began to lose their power in the years 1856 to 1860. Aided by the American Frederick T. Ward and the British Charles George Gordon, the imperialist army finally repulsed the rebels; the Taiping Rebellion came to an end in 1864.

The unique character of the Taiping Rebellion is its Christian flavor. Hung Hsiu-ch'uan, the titular head of the Rebellion, came under the influence of Liang A-fa, a Chinese Christian evangelist. Hung was instructed in the Christian faith for two months under Issachar J. Roberts, an American Baptist missionary in Canton, who incidentally refused Baptism to Hung. The rebel leader claimed he had a vision; "he had been carried to heaven and brought before a venerable old man who represented himself to Hung as the Creator of mankind . . . During similar sessions he met a middle-

aged man whom he heard called the Elder Brother and identified as Jesus Christ" (pp. 12-13). Gradually several thousand converts of Hung formed a religious society called the God-worshippers. In 1850, the God-worshippers began to engage in military and political activities, and after 1851 they started a full-fledged political rebellion.

In this study, Boardman concentrates on the first three years of the Rebellion, 1851-54, examining the relationship between the rebel use of Christian elements in their ideology and the final outcome of the Rebellion. The author attempts to solve the hitherto neglected questions: "What Christian religious literature was available to the Taipings between 1835 and 1853 . . . ? What part of the material reaching them did rebel leaders accept and use? What parts of what they saw did they discard? What was the basis for selection?" (p. 6).

The author catalogues "The Christian Component—What the Taipings Took" (Chap. 5) and "The Christian Component—What the Taipings Failed to Take" (Chap. 6) with careful documentation. For instance, the Taipings failed to understand the Christian concepts of love, concern for others, the kingdom of heaven, and humility. They perverted the Christian elements they had accepted by accommodating Chinese cultural values and political expediency. Boardman is very sympathetic with the historic setting in which the Taipings found themselves; they were exposed to the 19th century missionaries whose linguistic ability was questionable and whose theological attitude was fundamentalistic. Also, " . . . the faith that had been a pillar of strength to the internal structure became for them a stumbling-block in their relation with possible allies and with Chinese people as a whole" (p. 121). Nevertheless, Boardman, with his "catalogue system," seems to emphasize that Taiping Christianity was "unlike anything anticipated" and was not acceptable by the Western Christian brethren. This reviewer feels, however, that another aspect should be much more forcefully

emphasized—that is, that the character of the Taiping Rebellion, among other things, was much too "Christian" to be understood and supported by the Chinese.

JOSEPH M. KITAGAWA  
*Federated Theological Faculty*  
*University of Chicago*

*A Critical Study of Calvin's Concept of Faith.* By WALTER E. STUERMANN. University of Tulsa. Tulsa, Oklahoma, 1952. xv+397 pages. (No price indicated).

Many years ago, the Drew theologian Olin A. Curtis said that, as Calvin's primary feeling was profoundly Christian, the day was sure to come when all of Calvin's deep Christian vitalities would, sharply separated from his formal contentions, acquire a new significance (*Christian Faith*, p. 324). This doctoral dissertation evidences that, if not its noon, the dawn of the day foretold by Methodist Dr. Curtis seems now breaking through.

According to Calvin, the principle of our religion is that God has spoken (Cf. Calvin on II Tim. 3:16, Latin and French texts). *Epistemologically*, however, his concept of faith is the key doctrine (Stuermann, p. 72). Faith is not credulity, i.e., a mere assent to God's existence and Bible truth. Faith is a firm knowledge of God's benevolence towards us, revealed to our intellect and sealed in our sentiment by what our forefathers called the Holy Spirit.

This knowledge, therefore, is an extra-rational and mystic form of certainty, clearly distinct from what Calvin called historical faith, i.e., a mere knowledge of the story of Jesus. For our Reformer, there can indeed be no certainty without Divine Inspiration (Cf. Calvin on II Cor. 1:22). Thereby we acquire a security which gives peace to our mind and stability to our existence.

If the present reviewer's criticisms are desired they are that the middle editions of the *Institutes* (1539-1541) should have been more fully used because of their warmth and mystic fervor somehow obscured in the definitive and largest edition of 1559.

Moreover, Calvin's *Lectures and Sermons on Daniel* (Cf. e.g. Sermon on Daniel VI) could have been exploited. There our Reformer speaks of the credulity and superstition of our modern Babylonians who believe in God along with other gods, while Daniel had only one God. Finally, Dr. Stuermann has taken issue with Peter Brunner's assertion that faith in itself is nothing (pp. 52-56). Yet Calvin stated that should the Word of God be taken away, faith would be null (Cf. *Institutes*, III. II. 6). This was emphasized by the marginal gloss of the Amsterdam edition of 1667 *in loco citato* which stated that, apart from the knowledge of the Word, there can be no faith. Even apart from these statements, throughout Calvin's works faith can certainly be considered as an energy proceeding from God. If so, then without God, faith is surely nothing.

PAUL T. FUHRMAN

Gammon Theological Seminary

*The Moral Philosophie of the Stoicks*, Written in French by GUILLAUME DU VAIR, Englished by THOMAS JAMES. Edited with an Introduction and Notes by Rudolf Kirk, 1951. Rutgers University Press. pp. x, 134. \$3.50.

The body of this book (pp. 41-129) contains a reproduction (though not in format) of Thomas James' version (1598) of Guillaume du Vair's *La Philosophie Morale des Stoiques* (published in 1585). Professor Kirk says he chose to publish James' version rather than Charles Cotton's of 1664 because James' contains Du Vair's address "to the French reader," omitted by Cotton, and "since it appeared in the same decade as the French work and retains the savor of the original more completely than Cotton's translation." To these good reasons he might, I suspect, have added that Thomas James deserves better recognition. Britannica merely mentions James (in small print) as the first librarian of Thomas Bodley; *Britannica* (under Du Vair) names only Cotton as translator of *The Moral Philosophie*—.

The editor's brief life of Du Vair (pp. 7-14) comes largely from R. Radouant, *Guillaume Du Vair, L'orateur and Léontine Zanta, La Renaissance du Stoicism au XVI<sup>e</sup> Siècle*. Echoes from Zanta's book predominate. Almost nothing on Du Vair seems to be available in English. The present volume has supplied this lack to some extent. Georges Cahen-Salvador's *Un grand humaniste: Peiresc, 1580-1637* (Paris 1951) was perhaps being printed at the same time as Professor Kirk's book, and could therefore not be consulted. Cahen-Salvador has a good deal on Du Vair which does not appear in Zanta. He has gone into his correspondence with Peiresc, giving some intimate glimpses of his association with the younger man as his confidante.

Here and there comparisons appear between Du Vair and Justus Lipsius. Also in these Zanta is the main source. To those who have not seen Kirk and Hall's *Two Bookes of Conscience* (by Lipsius), what is unique in each—Du Vair and Lipsius—remains vague.

As one reads Du Vair's book on the Stoic moral philosophy one asks how it could be exciting to the author and his contemporaries. That it did excite, is a fact. It seemed to give zest to Catholics and Protestants alike. Du Vair, a bishop of the Roman Church, wrote it; Thomas James, who translated it, was more prominent as an anti-Catholic publicist than as the first Bodleian librarian. Was this revived Stoicism a humanistic affectation? Did it represent the discourse of exhortation and consolation among the learned who would feel diffident about the use of more specifically Christian language? Did it emanate from a feeling that the latter was pitched too high, or that—in the schisms of the time—it tended to deepen divisions? Was it a manner of feeling after a cosmopolitan discourse on the happiness of man? Such queries are suggested, for the book must have seemed vital to the 16th and 17th centuries.

As to the theological question of how Christian scholars can take Stoicism seriously Professor Kirk is con-

tent with what is put down by Du Vair himself. The subject must have tantalized the editor. To have entered upon it seriously would have added many pages. The letter of Du Vair's theological justification can satisfy both Catholic and Calvinistic orthodoxy. It repeats the familiar argument of the "gold and silver of the Egyptians." However, this argument effects one thing in Jerome, another in Aquinas. What does it effect here?

The short biography of Thomas James (c. 1572-1629) is told with learning and zest. It leans on the editor's knowledge of sources. Kirk should have enlarged much more upon this subject. The reviewer is something of an armchair strategist, and so he may appear quite outrageous to the writer who has fought the battle. However, I would suggest that, to get added space for James' life, he had done well to use the dozen pages devoted to "Du Vair's Neostoicism." There are uses in these pages, but they had been more profitably incorporated in the margin and in footnotes to Du Vair's book (pp. 43-128). This might have detracted from the elegant format of pages 43-128, but it would have made them more readable. Why should such reproductions not be broken up by section headings, marginal comments and footnotes?

Rutgers University is to be commended for spending money on expensive printing of good books, and the Press for doing a handsome job. Dr. Kirk's students are fortunate in a professor who manifests so much concern with the continental sources of English literature.

QUIRINUS BREEN

*University of Oregon*

*Bishops and Societies. A Study of Anglican Colonial and Missionary Expansion, 1698-1850.* By HANS CNATTINGIUS. London, S.P.C.K., 1952. xii+248.

This book deals primarily with the relationship between the official Church of England and the three Anglican missionary societies from 1698 to 1850. Dr. Cnattingius shows a

thorough grasp of the peculiar and multiple problems involved, and he develops his thesis with careful documentation.

The history of the Anglican Church may be divided into three periods: (1) the 16th and 17th centuries, during which period the Church of England developed as a national church; (2) the 18th and 19th centuries, when it expanded into a world-wide Anglican Communion with a missionary program; (3) the 20th century, with the Anglican Church striving toward ecumenical ideals. Cnattingius' research is a valuable contribution to the understanding of the second period. However, before discussing the book, a few comments concerning the historic setting may be helpful.

The Church of England, which had become independent of Rome through the legislative acts of 1531-1534, began to develop as a national church under Elizabeth. England, under Elizabeth, decided not to return to Rome nor to go all the way with the Continental Reformation. However, the Elizabethan settlement left many theological problems; for instance, the "episcopacy" as civil servant and ecclesiastical order was retained, but whether the "episcopacy" was of the *bene esse* or the *esse* of the Church was not clearly defined. After the Industrial Revolution there were signs that the old order in the Church as well as in the State was doomed. In this setting, we see the rise of evangelical Methodism and the high-church Oxford Movement. Also, the colonial problems became accentuated with the emigration of many people from the British Isles.

Dr. Cnattingius correctly points out that prior to the 18th century the Church of England was not concerned with foreign missions. The religious needs of colonial peoples were regarded as the responsibility of the Crown. In the meantime, during the 17th century the "Religious Society Movement" developed in England, influenced by Continental Pietism, and from this movement emerged three private missionary societies—the Society for the Propagation of the Gos-

pel in Foreign Parts (S.P.G.), the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (S.P.C.K.), and the Church Missionary Society (C.M.S.). Inevitably, there developed a tension between the official church leadership and private initiative as to "Who was to ordain and approve the missionaries? Who was to exercise jurisdiction and supervision over them? . . . Were the Church authorities to be allocated any particular position and authority in the home organization?" (p. 1).

This was a wholly new situation for the official church. It took a century and a half before a smooth rapport developed among (1) official church leaders, (2) missionary societies, (3) the state, 4) colonial bishops, (5) overseas committees of various missionary societies, and (6) missionaries. Cnatingius' narrative touches Canada, the West Indies, Australia, and New Zealand, but the main scene is India. By the middle of the 19th century, the Anglican Church developed a wider concept of "episcopacy," including the idea of a "missionary episcopate" which originated in the Protestant Episcopal Church in America. In the meantime, the missionary societies, though still not official organs of the church or state, became handmaids of the world-wide Anglican Communion.

The author knows how to tell stories by utilizing otherwise dull official documents and personal letters. Readers may become impatient as they read of the petty jealousies between "high" and "low" churchmen or of the lack of foresight on the part of policy makers. The sad ending of the century-old collaboration between the Anglican missionary societies and Lutheran missionaries in India is particularly heart-breaking.

The author's aim in this study is "to give account of the relations between these [missionary] societies and the bishops in their oversea work and to find the structure and the principle which determined these relations" (p. 2). But such "structure and principle" are stated in organizational terms, and the "Anglican doctrine of ministry and church order" is not discussed in

theological terms. Also, the author unfortunately does not discuss the relationship between missionary activities directed to the natives and the pastoral care of the English settlers.

Nevertheless, this book should be highly recommended to students of Church History, Canon Law, Ecumenical Movement and Missions.

JOSEPH M. KITAGAWA

*Federated Theological Faculty  
University of Chicago*

*The Journal of George Fox.* Ed. JOHN L. NICKALLS. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1952. xix, 789 pages.

"This new edition of George Fox's *Journal*," writes the editor, "is designed to replace for the general reader the text prepared by Thomas Ellwood, which was first published in 1694." Ellwood, as the present editor points out, had "adapted or omitted many of Fox's own vigorous phrases, his picturesque details, his apparent overvaluation of praise, claims to psychic powers, and matter thought liable to cause political or theological protest."

While critical editions of most of the literary materials which Ellwood utilized in constructing his edition of Fox's *Journal* have been available for some time, they have not been in a form which would appeal to anyone other than a student of the period. Nickalls has sought to meet the needs of the general reader and to remedy Ellwood's manifest deficiencies by reconstructing the *Journal* from the original documents and by modernizing the spelling and punctuation.

Nickall's principal source for the reconstructed text is the *Spence MS*, which was published verbatim in 1911 and has since then usually been referred to as the *Cambridge Journal*. This is an autobiographical narrative, dictated by Fox to Thomas Lower, his stepson-in-law, in 1675. At some points this narrative is supplemented by the MS known as *The Short Journal*, an account of a number of incidents occurring between 1647 and the time when Fox dictated his recollec-

tion of them in 1664. A few other seventeenth century sources have been utilized occasionally, and at several points Nickalls has had to depend wholly upon the Ellwood edition, notably for the period prior to 1650, since the first sixteen pages of the *Spence MS* are missing. This is unfortunate, for the years prior to 1650 were the critically important formative years, and Thomas Lower's brief note concerning "the first spreading of truth" (reprinted on page 709) is strong evidence that Ellwood's account of the rise of the movement is not altogether dependable. One might wish that the editor had called attention to this discrepancy.

The present text ends with the close of the *Spence MS* in 1675. An account of the last fifteen years of Fox's life by Henry J. Cadbury has been substituted for that composed by Thomas Ellwood in 1694. Carefully and discriminatingly prepared, this new edition should serve to win new readers for the *Journal* of the great Quaker leader and new friends for the truth exemplified in his life and teachings.

WINTHROP S. HUDSON

Colgate-Rochester Divinity School

---

*The Protestant Dissenting Deputies.* By BERNARD LORD MANNING. Ed. ORMEROD GREENWOOD. N. Y.: Cambridge University Press, 1952. 498 pages. \$10.00.

Since 1732, the Protestant Dissenting Deputies have consisted of two members chosen annually from each congregation of the three old Dissenting denominations—Presbyterian, Congregational, and Baptist—"in and within twelve miles of London" (originally ten miles). Their function has been to protect the "civil rights" of Dissenters wherever they might be threatened, whether within the realm or beyond the seas in the colonies. The executive arm of the Deputies has always been a smaller Committee of Twenty-one elected annually and meeting at frequent intervals as occasion demanded. The complete Minutes of the activities of the Deputies have

been preserved with the exception of the volume covering the period from 1909 to 1941 which was destroyed by enemy action during World War II. These Minutes provide the basis for the present study and constitute a mine of information concerning "the three old denominations": the peculiar position they occupied "under the Toleration Act with their privileged status on the one side and their lack of ordinary rights on the other." The Minutes reveal, in detail and at close range, the way in which court actions were instigated, public opinion mobilized, and the pressure of "the Dissenting interest" brought to bear upon Parliament. Much of the story is almost incredible—the imprisonment, for example, of two Welshmen as late as 1838 for failure to attend the services of the established church.

"As far as I am aware," Bernard Manning wrote before his death in 1942, "no one has ever read these Minutes except for severely practical purposes."

"They appear to be unknown to 19th century historians. Even a writer like Halévy has the most sketchy notions about the Deputies. Yet they are the most important of all the keys to an understanding of the political importance of Dissent in the 18th and 19th centuries, because they record the day-to-day activities of the most active of all the Dissenters. Much has been made of the political activities of the Methodists, of the importance of the Quakers and Unitarians, but the three historic bodies of Dissenters have never taken their natural place in the story. They acted until far into the 19th century mainly through the Dissenting Deputies."

The Deputies not only carried on agitation for the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, the removal of disabilities with regard to the registration of births, performance of marriage rites, place of burial, opportunities for education, and the abolition of church rates, church courts, and the establishment; they supplied legal aid to Dissenters whose rights had been infringed in areas where no local attorney dared take their case.



Not the least interesting of the activities of the Deputies were those in which they served as an unofficial legation for the New England colonies. Possessing the right of approach to the King and the Court, the Deputies were frequently called upon to speak in behalf of colonial concerns—most notably and successfully with regard to the attempt to introduce Anglican bishops in America. On other occasions, the Deputies felt compelled to admonish the New Englanders and to urge them to moderate the disabilities imposed by the Standing Order. Elsewhere in the colonies, the Deputies frequently intervened to secure the licensing of meeting-houses.

WINTHROP S. HUDSON

*Colgate-Rochester Divinity School*

*The Life and Times of Daniel Lindley* (1801-1880). By EDWIN W. SMITH. New York, Library Publishers, 1952. (English imprint. London, Epworth Press, 1949). xxx+456 pages. \$5.50.

It is good to find a missionary biography in which the subject is not treated in a vacuum but portrayed against the movements of his day. Daniel Lindley's ministry is continuously related to events both in South Africa and in the United States. The story is thoroughly documented not only by references to Lindley's letters and those of his less reticent family and colleagues but, also, by contemporary South African sources and British Government documents. The author is a renowned South African missionary scholar and anthropologist.

The son of a pioneer family on the western Pennsylvania-Ohio frontier, Daniel Lindley studied theology at Hampden-Sydney Seminary and then served as pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Rocky River, North Carolina, the strongest rural church in the state. There he had a notable ministry, but he soon left to become a member of the first group of missionaries sent to South Africa by the American Board. However, he remained a member of Concord Pres-

bytery until his death. Irenic in spirit and possessing a strong sense of loyalty, he did not follow his father and other relatives into the Cumberland Presbyterian Church nor did he, a slavery-hating Northerner, withdraw when after the division he found himself a member of the Southern Presbyterian Church. Similarly, when the Presbyterians parted company with the American Board and, later, when the Presbyterian Church in the United States created its own foreign missionary board, Lindley saw no reason to leave the agency under which he first went to Africa.

Daniel Lindley arrived in South Africa in 1835 just as the Boers were beginning their trek across the Vaal and into Natal. His newly founded Matebele Mission was given up when warfare between the Boers and the tribes-people laid waste the region, although Robert Moffat thought this a mistake. The Boers, with whom the missionaries trekked, so admired Lindley's swimming, marksmanship, ability to judge a horse, and manual skill that they bestowed on him the compliment, "just like a Boer." Moreover, in appearance and manner he seemed the personification of their idea of a minister. Moved by the ignorance and spiritual want prevailing among the immigrants, Lindley began to minister to them. The *Volksraad* appointed him *Predikant*, and when the British took over Natal he was reappointed.

The immigrants were disowned by the Dutch Reformed churches in Cape Colony and no Reformed minister would serve them. Therefore Lindley spent seven and a half years as their minister, itinerating widely, organizing congregations, fostering the spiritual life, baptizing, confirming, marrying, and teaching school. He confirmed many of the future Boer leaders, including President Paul Kruger, and to this day his memory is honored by the Boers. Lindley was drawn into the ministry to the Boers because of their need, his liking for them, their response to him, and because he felt that at that period he could

make his best contribution to the Zulus by serving the Boers.

Events on the American frontier had taught Daniel Lindley what fate a primitive people might expect at the hands of land-hungry white settlers. Seeing that the white settlers were divided on whether to reduce the natives to serfdom or segregate them on reservations, called locations, he used his influence to secure as much land as possible for the Africans and served on the original Locations Commission. He was alarmed by the importation of Indian laborers, which further complicated racial relations and labor problems.

After surrendering his pastorate at Pietermaritzburg, Lindley returned to the American Zulu Mission and built the Inanda Station to which he devoted himself until retirement. Dr. Smith paints a vivid picture of pioneer missionary life and work at Inanda, and in this Daniel and his interesting family (eleven children) profited by their nearness to the American frontier. The name of Dr. Newton Adams appears again and again and reminds one that the story of the American Zulu Mission will not be complete until his biography has been written.

Daniel Lindley was a man of his day. He identified western culture with Christianity to a considerable degree. He began with a low estimate of the Zulu character and culture and was opposed to the retention of native customs. However, he was big enough to surrender his prejudices and gradually he came to a higher appreciation of the people, their customs, and their culture. He took leadership in placing the churches under their own native pastors. Although maintaining a friendly cooperation with government, he opposed government subsidies for mission work and missionary salaries.

*The Life and Times of Daniel Lindley* is an introduction to the origins of the crisis in which South Africa today finds itself. That crisis has been a century and a quarter in the making.

R. PIERCE BEAVER

*Missionary Research Library*

*The Churches in English Fiction.*

By ANDREW L. DRUMMOND. Chicago: Alec R. Allenson (Blessing's Book Company), 1950. 324 pages, \$3.50.

First this reviewer wishes to express the pleasure which this book has given him, from reminding of many novels, great, good, and not so good, yet of interest for the purpose in hand; from insights into important chapters of religious and social history; and from contact with an author of very wide and discerning reading, in hundreds of novels, in criticism contemporary and modern, in history, biography, and theology, and always of diverting style. Dr. Drummond's time is the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and his chapters are "Evangelicalism in the English Church," "The High-Church Movement," covering Tractarianism and Anglo-Catholicism, "Roman Catholicism," "The Broad Church Novel," with "Products in England and America," "The Church of Scotland," "The English Free Churches," "New England Puritanism." A Scottish Presbyterian, he is impartial and broadly and deeply sympathetic.

Take the two Broad Church chapters as exemplifying the author's contents. In the middle of the nineteenth century the wretched conditions of the workers were forced on the conscience of England by novels, *Hawkstone*, by William Sewell, an Oxford don and a Tractarian, too much forgotten, and, far more important, Charles Kingsley's *Alton Locke* and *Yeast*, one for the town, the other for the country. Kingsley's books powerfully spread his and Maurice's Christian Socialism. Mrs. Lynn Linton's *Joshua Davidson* (1872) described a Cornish carpenter who in London slums found the English church failing to apply Christian ethics to the life of the people, "sets himself to live and act in all respects like the Carpenter of Nazareth" and is killed by a mob. It went into eleven editions in twenty years, and inspired the Boston social gospel pioneer Jesse Jones to publish in 1907 *Joshua Davidson, Christian*. So late as 1895 came *Stephen Remarx*,

by the Hon. and Rev. J. G. Adderley, which "reads like a Christian Socialist tract" and reached its twelfth cheap edition in 1904.

The Broad Church novel dealt also with religious thought. In 1888 Mrs. Humphrey Ward, belonging to the Oxford "liberal group that sought theological emancipation and social reform," published her famous *Robert Elsmere*, about a young clergyman who, under the influence of negative Biblical criticism, lost his Christian faith and resigned his parish. The book roused a storm, in England and also in America; Gladstone wrote an article on "Robert Elsmere and the Battle of Belief." Twenty-three years later Mrs. Ward wrote *The Case of Richard Meynell*, about an abler and mature clergyman, fully loyal to Christianity, who advocated liberty toward the creeds and the liturgy and won many followers, prophetic of the Modern Churchmen. Disciplined, he "won a moral victory."

A little before *Robert Elsmere*, Margaret Deland published *John Ward, Preacher*. In orthodox Pennsylvania Presbyterianism an orthodox young minister has a wife who rejects verbal inspiration and eternal punishment, and the end is tragedy. Overwrought somewhat, the novel had influence. "Margaret Deland and Mary Ward stimulated the flow of novels dealing with theological emancipation and the social implications of Christianity," Dr. Drummond says, "and quite a crop . . . emerged about the turn of the century," on some of which in America he reports interestingly. His last American example is Winston Churchill's *The Inside of the Cup* (1913), which sold 900,000 copies. A young clergyman of a prosperous Episcopal church becomes a modernist and a social reformer and is resisted by his wealthy parishioners, many of whom are involved in political and financial corruption. The outcome is their departure and a regenerated though poorer congregation.

Dr. Drummond comes in the course of his plan, in one aspect or another, to the eminent English and Scottish novelists, Jane Austen, Scott, Dickens

and Thackeray, mostly satirical, Disraeli, much concerned in his novels with religious affairs, Kingsley, George Eliot, Charlotte Brontë, Samuel Butler of *The Way of All Flesh*, George MacDonald, Stevenson, Barrie. He gives large space, still hardly enough, to Trollope, who is classed with High Church, but is of wider reach. More space is given to Shorthouse of *John Inglesant*, which appears in the High Church, Roman Catholic and Broad Church chapters, and is rated very high. In America Dr. Drummond devotes deserved length to Mrs. Stowe's novels of New England religious life. But he finds much material for his history in many novels by less distinguished writers, widely read and discussed and influential in their times, some still remembered, some still reprinted, such as those of Mrs. Oliphant and the English Free Churchman "Mark Rutherford."

The author's method, with many novels, is to give lively summaries of plots and descriptions of characters, with quotations of conversations among them and in their families, placed in environments political, social, ecclesiastical, theological. There are full accounts of pertinent things in the lives, personalities and opinions of the authors. There are reports of the reception of novels and gossip stories of family life as affected by them. Interspersed is much judicious and enlightening criticism, literary and theological. All this is written informally, with enthusiasm and abundant humor. A great deal of religious and literary history is painlessly imparted.

ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS  
New York City

---

*History of the Y.M.C.A. in North America.* By C. HOWARD HOPKINS. New York: Association Press. 1951. xiv-818 pages.

The year 1951 was the centennial of the establishment of the Y.M.C.A. in the United States. The first Association to be formed was that in Boston. The movement had begun in London fifteen years before under the leadership of George Williams, a young clerk in a leading London dry

goods firm. Previous to his coming to London young Williams had experienced conversion, joined the Congregational church and at once became an active Sunday School worker. While the first glow of his new found religious experience was still warm within him he came upon the sermons of Charles G. Finney, then at the height of his fame as an evangelist on both sides of the Atlantic and Williams was stirred to action. He wanted to do something for the 150,000 young-men clerks, who, like himself, were living in crowded rooms above the stores where they were employed. Moral conditions among them were low and intemperance common. He succeeded in forming a London Association of twelve charter members, equally divided among four denominations, Church of England, Methodist, Congregationalist and Baptist, and thus the movement got off to an interdenominational start.

Revivalism created the environment for the introduction of the Y.M.C.A. to America, and the mushrooming cities furnished the soil in which the seed was to find rootage. Within fifteen years after the opening of the first Y.M.C.A. in Boston, fifty-six Associations had been organized from Toronto and Halifax on the north, to Natchez, Mississippi, New Orleans and Houston, Texas on the South. By the latter fifties paid workers were being employed, one of the first being John Wanamaker of Philadelphia, soon to become the founder of the great mercantile business which still carries on in his name. His salary was \$1000, guaranteed by the President of the Association, George H. Stuart, though as the author remarks, young Wanamaker raised most of it himself, establishing a pattern which most of his successors have found it necessary to follow.

The early Associations were closely related to the evangelical churches and were imbued with the practical-minded revivalism of the Finney and Moody type. Indeed the name Dwight L. Moody bulks large in the early history of the American Y.M.C.A. Moody came to Chicago in 1856 as a

shoe salesman and brought his religion along. Active in Church and Sunday School work from the start, in 1860 he gave up business to devote himself entirely to missionary work. Between 1865 and 1869 he served as president of the Chicago Y.M.C.A. and collected the funds for Chicago's first Y.M.C.A. building. The most important national Y.M.C.A. leader in the early years of the movement however, was William Chauncy Langdon, co-founder of the Washington Association, the father of the first American confederation of Y.M.C.A.'s and one of the principal leaders in the formation of the World Alliance of the Y.M.C.A.

Unfortunately the American Association got started with an evangelical test for membership which limited active membership to members of evangelical churches. Langdon was one of the opponents of this test and after he took orders in the Protestant Episcopal Church, and having failed to secure a repeal of the test, severed his relationship with the Association. In recent years the Association has restated its position, adopting as a unifying principle, *loyalty* to Jesus Christ rather than a creedal statement, declaring that the Y.M.C.A. is a world-wide fellowship of men and boys united by a common loyalty to Jesus Christ for the purpose of building personality and a Christian society.

A mere listing, with the briefest characterization, of the many phases of Y.M.C.A. activities treated in this crowded volume would take much more space than this review can give. The story of its international activities under the leadership of John R. Mott alone deserves a volume. The Student Volunteer Movement and the missionary impact of the Y.M.C.A. upon the churches is another topic of great importance, which in this reviewer's judgment deserves more attention than it has here received. The author would have profited in dealing with it had he consulted the excellent doctor's dissertation at the University of Chicago by William Boehm on the history of the Student Volunteer

Movement. The story of student work in colleges and universities throughout of the land is another phase of "Y" history to which the author has given large attention and deservedly so. The recruiting and training of Y.M.C.A. secretaries, its educational program and the establishment of the "Y" Colleges are topics fully covered. The ecumenical influences of the Association is one of its most significant contributions.

The Committee on Historical Resources under whose supervision this history has been prepared was indeed fortunate in securing Dr. C. Howard Hopkins, a trained historian, to undertake the exacting task of writing this volume. He in turn was fortunate in having the collaboration of the Chairman of the Committee, S. Wirt Wiley, whose assistance was invaluable in locating and assembling sources as well as in planning the book. He carefully read all preliminary drafts of the manuscript and "every word of the galley proof" and would seem almost to deserve the title of co-author. Perhaps he too may have been chiefly responsible for the chief weakness of the book, for it is far too crowded with facts and names, many of which have slight significance, which makes it extremely difficult for the reader to keep track of the story.

WILLIAM W. SWEET

---

*History of the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in the United States, 1825-1934; Evangelical and Reformed Church 1934-1952.* By GEORGE RICHARDS, Lancaster, Pa., 1952. 660 pp.

For more than a quarter of a century the names of George Richards and the Reformed Church have been synonymous. Everywhere in ecumenical and other church councils president Richards has represented his church with distinction and it is fitting that he who knows this branch of Christianity better than any other should have written the history of the Lancaster seminary, the fourteenth to be founded in the United States.

This is a book of major proportions, a full 660 pages, including topical bibliography listing manuscript sources, published books and pamphlets as well as a comprehensive list of articles published in non-denominational literature. In addition to all this the fifth part of this work includes biographical sketches of all former members of the faculty of the Reformed Seminary written by Richards and others.

The first part of the book is devoted to the preparation for the seminary in the pre-coetal period, 1720-1746; the coetal period, 1747-1792; and the synodal period (A), 1792-1817. The detailed preparation for the seminary in the synodal period (B), 1817-1824, is described in Part Two. The third and major part of this history, including over 350 pages, is devoted to the chronological development of the theological school first at Carlisle, then at York, later at Mercersburg and finally at Lancaster, Pa. By no means least, although one of the briefer sections, is the fourth part of this work in which Richard interprets the spirit and purpose of the seminary. Here and in his interpretation of the Mercersburg Movement under J. W. Nevin and Philip Schaff the author is at his best. The Mercersburg emphasis on the historic church and the liturgy is the unique contribution of this denomination to Christian history and no one has better described this movement than the author. The book is well illustrated.

RAYMOND W. ALBRIGHT  
*The Episcopal Theological School,*  
Cambridge, Mass.

---

*Principalities and Powers. Studies in the Christian Conflict in History.* By GORDON RUPP. New York and Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1952. 143 pages. \$2.00.

For "the wayfaring Christian who tries to make sense of his Bible and his newspaper," this little volume presents a helpful guide into the "no man's land" between the fields of theology and history. First for BBC listeners, now for the reading public,



Professor Rupp has served up a refreshing untechnical discussion of profound problems: time and history, truth and power, history and eschatology, divine action and human action. All of these come to a focus in the problem of the forces of evil in history. Personified "principalities and powers," St. Paul's day called them, abstract "'anities' and 'alities' and 'ologies' and 'isms,'" we say today; but the conflict remains basically the same.

Modern man has disastrously misunderstood the rampant nature of evil. He embraces the superficial progress doctrines of pseudo-Christian romanticism or of materialism, or he succumbs to a paralyzing pessimism, religious or irreligious. Against these, the author fervidly preaches an "optimism of grace," like that of the early Christians, the Reformers, the puritans, the 19th century English social reformers, and his own 18th century Methodists: a faith which courageously battles against evils because Jesus Christ has spoiled the principalities and powers.

ROBERT H. FISCHER

*Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary, Maywood, Illinois*

*Scientism, Man, and Religion.*

By D. R. G. OWEN. Philadelphia: Westminster Press. 208 pp. \$3.50.

Alfred Marshall once warned economists who confine their studies to the price mechanism lest they "fall tacitly into the fallacy of regarding what is tractable to our intellectual machinery as equivalent to what is important." The present volume is a study of the ways in which pseudo-science has constructed an apparatus that conceals and even ignores the most important aspects of human nature—man as spirit, man as subject.

Science, according to Professor Owen, employs four basic principles: the empirical, the quantitative, the mechanical, and the progressive. The empirical principle insists upon verifiability in the order of the physically observable, the second principle insists upon precise measure, the third upon discernible cause and effect, and the fourth enables science to be self-

corrective and cumulative. Confining itself to the use of these principles, science does not presume to speak about the whole of reality or about spirit, values and freedom.

Scientism, on the other hand, ignores these self-imposed limitations of science and distends the principles into universal dogmas. "Scientolatriy" presumes to make science omniscient; extending the application of the four principles to the whole of reality, it offers a sort of religion of "science," or rather an anti-religion. This anti-religion appears in various compounds of materialism, determinism, naturalism, and relativism. It not only rules out the possibility of God and eternal values. It is also anti-humanist, for it rules out man as free and creative spirit. It overlooks the fact that spirit is not tractable to the machinery of scientism.

Certain major routes, either parallel or linked and connecting, which the religion of pseudo-science has taken are traced in detail by the author: the line from Hobbesian materialism down through socialism and economism to Russian communism; the course from Rousseauist psychological naturalism through romanticist glorification of instinct to Freudianism and Nazism; the lineage from early scientific empiricism through utilitarianism and pragmatism to contemporary bourgeois economism and scientific relativism. In tracing these lines of passage the author gives detailed exposition and criticism of such figures as Hobbes, Comte, and Marx, Rousseau, Freud, and Hitler, Hume, Darwin, Mill, and Dewey. In all of these routes he finds ingredients of the dogma of progress (as vulgarized and dilated from the more modest progressive principle of science and as seemingly confirmed by technological advance) which in its most conspicuous conjugations issues in capitalist materialism and communist utopianism; the worship of the dollar in the West is the twin of the worship of economic forces in Russia. Indeed, "it was bourgeois society that first of all destroyed all values except the commercial." All



these routes lead in the same direction: God and eternal values are denied; and man becomes a mere thing.

The critical reader may quarrel with certain of the characterizations and oversimplifications of the figures and movements dealt with. It is doubtful, for example, if social scientists will accept the characterization of the principles of science, and in particular the exclusion of concern with quality (in favor of quantity). One may question also whether all the genealogical lines which the author traces are accurate or adequate. Russian totalitarianism has roots in nondemocratic Russian tradition as well as in Marx; Nazi exaltation of blood and soil depends much less upon Freud than is claimed in the chapter on "Freudianism and the Nazi Society," even though the antecedents of the two are related. J. S. Mill, in the name of *quality* of pleasure, criticized Bentham's hedonistic calculus rather than transmitting and intensifying his emphasis on *quantity* of pleasure; moreover, the positive contributions of utilitarianism are missed if one neglects its sociology in favor of its psychology.

But these criticisms do not seriously impair the value of Dr. Owen's study; the book deserves a wide reading. As a delineation of the lines of influence culminating in and issuing from modern "scientolatry" with its dehumanization of man as subject and as spirit, and also as a plea for the uniting of human wisdom and scientific knowledge for the overcoming under God of this dehumanization, the volume offers a sharp and well-documented and timely demand for new beginnings. The reading of this volume should help both religion and science to avoid the mistake of regarding what is tractable to their intellectual machinery of the moment as necessarily equivalent to what is important. In our mass society and in our atomic age the stakes are high—they include the preservation of man himself as well as of science and religion.

JAMES LUTHER ADAMS  
*The Meadville Theological School*  
*The University of Chicago*

*By The Way.* By FRANCIS J. McCONNELL. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1952. 286 pages. \$3.50.

Because of Bishop McConnell's manifold activities and numerous contacts on the social, economic, religious, national and international levels, any book about him, autobiographical or otherwise, should be of interest to the American reader. *By The Way* presents insights into the inner nature of a remarkable church leader who, during a long life of deep thinking and widespread activities, never indulged in self-advertising. In addition, the author includes many revealing pen sketches of outstanding church and world leaders, such as William Temple, Bryan, Wilson, Roosevelt, Hoover, MacDonald, Laski, ("he knew too much"), Darrow, and others.

As ingenuous as Wesley, the writer does not hesitate to uncover his own inadequacies. Note a reflection upon his younger days: "I suffered from extemporaneous glibness which I mistook for fluency" (247). With this quality went a refreshing willingness to overlook faults in others. But where condemnation was really needed, it was forthcoming. One clue to the bishop's thinking is imbedded in the assertion that "there has been no more pestilent heresy in the history of organized Christianity than the belief that the divine favor is most surely revealed to men by prosperity in money" (104).

The peculiar functioning of Methodist ecclesiastical machinery receives clarification, as well as some strange manifestations in the realm of "clerical politics." As an aside one cannot omit reference to a disgruntled delegate who opposed the candidacy of McConnell with the snort that if a mosquito ever bit the candidate, "it would die of a chill."

An abundance of wit and humor greet the eye. When Brother Van (a pioneer preacher of the West) confronted a bandit with the querv—"You would not rob a poor Methodist preacher?" he immediately replied, "No, I'm a Methodist myself." (124)

In the bishop's first area of supervision, which included Mexico, he met a rebuff at the hands of a missionary, Miss Laura Temple, because of her refusal to leave at his request, stating that her staying in Mexico or not was none of his business.

While in China he was confronted with the practical mind, voiced in a request: "Cut out the deep stuff, and talk about the Steel Strike" (169). India impressed him with its glaring contrasts. One incident depicts the bishop carrying a big gun on a real tiger hunt. Another sees him stepping aside in order to allow a sacred cow, which had nudged him from the rear, to take his place in a street procession. Later we find the bishop helping a vendor to push his ice cream cart in order to escape a threatening Moham-medan mob.

We can imagine how the bishop must have felt in being introduced to a certain Negro conference as a man "who can write books so deep that nobody on earth can understand them." Into the complexities of the color and segregation problem, McConnell saw deeply and clearly. His statements about the Methodist Federation for

Social Action reveal his courage as a true leader who never flinched from taking up an unpopular cause, especially where some human being suffered by unjust treatment. In the famous Steel Strike of 1919, "long-haired men and short-haired women" were after his scalp. In time he became the president of or participant in numerous organizations created for the defense of the "underdog."

This life story appears at an opportune time. It serves as a foil to chronic pessimism which finds nothing good except in the declaration that there is no good. It counters the anti-absolutist positions of those who make an absolute of prevailing relativisms. In our day of increasing hysteria, McConnell's voice impresses one with its calm and sage wisdom. In the midst of despair and disillusionment, his counsels carry weight because of their sanity and hope. In short, he stands as exemplar of the "dangerous Christian", so badly needed in our time of complacency, confusion, and compromise.

A. W. NAGLER

*Garrett Biblical Institute*

## MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL

December 29, 1952

The Council of the American Society of Church History met at 10:00 a.m. and again at luncheon in the Hotel Burlington, Washington, D. C. At the call of Vice-President Sidney Mead, Matthew Spinka led in prayer. Other members present were: Winthrop S. Hudson, Guy S. Klett, John T. McNeill, J. H. Nichols, Ray C. Petry, L. J. Trinterud, Raymond W. Albright and W. W. Rockwell.

The minutes of the Council meeting of December 27, 1951 were approved as printed in the March issue (1952) of CHURCH HISTORY.

Winthrop S. Hudson and L. J. Trinterud were appointed a committee to audit the books of the treasurer, whose report was presented and discussed.

For the editors J. H. Nichols presented a report which was received and its recommendations adopted. (See the Minutes of the Society).

W. W. Rockwell, Chairman, John T. McNeill and Robert H. Nichols were appointed a committee to ascertain the possibilities of bringing to completion the society's project of the translation and publication of Zwingli's Latin Works and, if possible, to report to the Spring meeting of the society proposals as to editor and publisher.

For failure to comply with the constitutional provisions the following persons were dropped from membership:

Thomas P. Bailey, Ford L. Battles, S. G. Blenker, Catherine Boyd, J. P. Cox, Wm. A. Crawford, Joseph R. Frese, Arthur H. George, Bert H. Hall, Robert B. Hannen, Henry G. Hillier, George A. Johnson, William Lyons, Charles H. Lyttle, Jacob C. Meyer, Rice A. Pierce, Wilder R. Reynolds, Paul J. Roeder, Emory R. Searcy, Richard W. Shreefler, Robert M. Stevenson, Donald E. Tansley, Glenn Weaver, Lemuel A. Welles, Newell J. Wert, and William G. West.

The resignations of the following persons were accepted with regret:

G. S. Benson, Thomas E. Drake, N. Robert Gill, Frances K. Hendriks, Irving S. Kull, O. Gerald Lawson, Benjamin Lott, John O. McGowan, Arthur Nussbaum, George W. Richards, Garrett C. Roorda, Paul Schubert, Richard L. Smith, Samuel E. Stumpf, John R. Weiler and Philip W. Weiss.

The secretary reported the deaths of Jack Wesley Fall, Sidney B. Harry, Herman O. A. Keinath, and K. J. Stratemeier.

The following persons, properly nominated, were elected members of the society, subject to the constitutional provision: Barbara Jean Allen, Henry Allen, Marvin C. Baarman, Cornelius N. Bakker, Jr., William H. Barr, Allen Z. Bodey, Julius Briller, Robert McAfee Brown, William Cadwallader, James Cameron, Paul D. Cameron, Paul D. Caranetta, Kenneth Carroll, N. Keith Clifford, J. Ayson Clifford, Roger Deschner, Richard P. Coombs, William Cross, Alan G. Deale, Reginald W. Deitz, Howard W. Derby, Elton M. Eenigenburg, Robert Egigian, Gordon G. Frazee, Harold Fair, James L. Garrett, John H. Giltner, Leonard Gittings, C. M. Goethe, E. Clayton Gooden, Arthur W. Greeley, Ralph Greenlow, Joseph Gregori, Charles Guilbert.

Kenneth F. Hall, Floyd E. Hartgett, Lyman R. Hartley, Jr., Russell Hensley, Donald W. Herb, Kenneth G. Hobart, Don W. Holter, Robert Holtzheimer, H. M. Jansen, Cecil William Johnson, John Mitchell Justice, Alfred R. Kahler, Jr., Noel L. Keith, William Nigel Kerr, Lester Kinzie, Lewis J. Knight, Bertram W. Korn, Karl Laantee, William J. Loar, Lester G. McAllister, Harold F. McGee, William E. McGrew, A. Stanley MacNair, Frederick McNeill, Clyde Leonard Manschreck, E. Charles Markman, J. Stewart Miller, Carl S. Mundinger, E. Clifford Nelson, Douglas M. Parrott, Florence Petherick, W. G. Piersel, Arthur Carl Piepkorn, Kenneth M. Plummer, Henry Poettcker, James Hybert Pollard.

Otto T. Rafos, Frank Reid, James B. Reid, Jesse A. Remington, Clarence S. Roddy, Frederick Q. Shafer, David Siegenthaler, William Sutfin, W. Ralph Thompson, John D. Trefzger, Harold Gordon Van Sickle, Armin

George Weng, Jr., Earl West, Anne Wiebe, Leslie Spencer Williams, Robert S. Wilson, John E. Wrigley, Thomas Yonker, Lowell H. Zuck.

The report of the Treasurer was received and provisionally approved, pending the auditing.

## MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL MEETING

December 29, 1952

The seventy-third consecutive meeting of the society was held in the Ball Room of the Hotel Burlington, Washington, D. C. at 7:30 P. M. with vice-president Sidney E. Mead in the chair.

The society approved the minutes of the previous annual meeting as printed in the March issue (1952) of *CHURCH HISTORY*. Changes in the membership of the society were reported by the secretary, showing a net gain of forty-four members.

Guy S. Klett read his report as treasurer. For the auditors Winthrop Hudson reported that the treasurer's accounts were found correct and the books in proper order. The treasurer's report was adopted as printed above.

For the editors, J. H. Nichols presented the report which was received by the society with a special vote of thanks to the editors. The report with its recommendations was approved as follows:

"The sudden death early this year of our printer, Mr. Clifton Sprunger, was a loss to those members of the editorial board who had known him over the years. After some unavoidable delays our printing affairs were re-organized and are now proceeding very satisfactorily. An increase of about 10% in printer's costs has been covered within our appropriation and with no changes in our magazine.

The completion of two years of publication at the larger size of 96 pages an issue makes possible some evaluation. The surveys of current research are now accumulating to a

substantial body of material. Articles are contributed in nearly three times the volume which it is possible to print. There remains a shortage, however, of first class articles in certain periods, especially ancient and medieval church history. The book reviewing section is being built up rather slowly to the size and quality which it should possess.

Dean Littell's *Anabaptist View of the Church*, the last Brewer Prize essay published directly by the Society, has now been on sale for some months. Dr. Ira Brown's study of Lyman Abbot will be published by the Harvard University Press, probably late in 1953.

In face of the removal of Dr. Pauck from Chicago to New York next summer the editorial board advises that co-editors of *CHURCH HISTORY* be elected who live in the same city.

The Editorial Board also recommends that the budget for *CHURCH HISTORY* in 1953 be \$2500.00, subject to reconsideration at the Spring Meeting of the Society if conditions or the finances of the Society demand it."

The secretary was instructed to send a letter of greeting to president Sanford Fleming, absent because of illness.

The society expressed satisfaction with the joint meeting held with the American Association of Theological Schools in Louisville, Ky., in June, 1952, and approved similar cooperation in the future.

Upon invitation from Garrett

Biblical Institute through Frederick Norwood the society voted to meet at Evanston, Ill., for its spring meeting, on April 24 and 25, 1953. The annual meeting is to be held at Chicago in December, 1953.

John Brush read the report of the committee on nominations and the society elected the following persons to the respective offices and committees:

President, Sidney E. Mead  
Vice-President, Carl E. Schneider  
Secretary, Raymond W. Albright  
Assistant Secretary, Mervin M. Deems  
Treasurer, Guy S. Klett  
Editors, J. H. Nichols and L. J. Trinterud (from summer 1953)

Other Members of the Council: Ernest G. Schwiebert, Winthrop S. Hudson, Massey H. Shepherd, Ray C. Petry, Sandford Fleming, George Williams, and Quirinus Breen.

Editorial Board of CHURCH HISTORY: J. H. Nichols and L. J. Trinterud (from summer 1953) with the cooperation of Roland H. Bainton, R. Pierce Beaver, Robert Grant, Winthrop S. Hudson, Sidney E. Mead, Wilhelm Pauck, Ray C. Petry and Matthew Spinka.

Membership Committee: Matthew Spinka, Chairman, J. M. Batten, Robert W. Goodloe, Harold Grimm, Robert Handy, Lefferts Loetscher, Frederick Norwood, Bard Thompson and John von Rohr.

Investment of Endowment Funds: Robert H. Nichols, Chairman, Guy S. Klett, Frederick Loetscher.

Research Committee: Shelton Smith, Chairman, Roland Bainton, Ford Bat-

ties, Harold Bender, Jerald Brauer, Paul T. Fuhrmann, Robert Grant, Cyril Richardson, Matthew Spinka, W. W. Sweet and George Williams.

Committee on Nominations: Paul Eller, Chairman, Winthrop S. Hudson, and Ray C. Petry.

Committee on Program and Local Arrangements for the Annual Meeting: Wilhelm Pauck, Chairman, Mervin M. Deems, Robert Fischer and Raymond W. Albright, *ex officio*.

Committee on Program and Local Arrangements for the Spring Meeting: Frederick Norwood, Chairman, Jerald Brauer, Franklin Littell and Raymond W. Albright, *ex officio*.

Committee on Program and Local Arrangements for the Pacific Coast Meeting: Paul B. Means, Chairman, John L. Anderson, Robert D. Clark, Sandford Fleming, Charles W. Hovland and Ralph Hyslop.

The President appointed to the Brewer Prize Committee: Paul Eller (chairman), R. E. E. Harkness, and Ira Brown.

The program at this meeting included the following papers: "Marguerite d' Angoulême and the French Lutherans" by Daniel Walther; "Policies and Achievements of the American Society of Church History Since its Formation in 1888" by William Walker Rockwell; "Sources for the Study of American Church History in the Library of Congress" by Nelson R. Burr; "Christian Beginnings in Colorado" by Martin Rist; and "The Pansophic Theories of John Amos Comenius" by Matthew Spinka.

Attest: Raymond W. Albright,  
Secretary.

# REPORT OF THE TREASURER OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

December 1, 1951 - November 30, 1952

## I. CURRENT FUNDS

### A. SUMMARY AND BALANCE

#### *Receipts*

Balance on hand, December 1, 1951 .....	\$ 1,655.92
Membership dues .....	\$ 1,944.80
Income from CHURCH HISTORY .....	1,229.61
Studies—see Schedule C .....	311.26
	<hr/>
	3,485.67
Total receipts .....	\$ 5,141.59

#### *Disbursements*

Expenses of management of Society .....	\$ 921.05
Publication of CHURCH HISTORY .....	2,693.93
Studies—see Schedule C .....	296.80
	<hr/>
Total disbursements .....	\$ 3,911.78

Cash on hand, November 30, 1952

Fidelity-Philadelphia Trust Co., Checking account, Bank statement .....	\$ 1,844.59
Less outstanding checks .....	614.78
	<hr/>
	1,229.81
	<hr/>
	\$5,141.59

### B. GENERAL FUNDS AND MAGAZINE

#### *Receipts*

Membership dues	
1949— 1 member .....	\$ 3.00
1950— 2 members .....	7.00
1951— 17 members .....	68.25
1952—464 members .....	1,847.05
1953— 7 members .....	19.50
	<hr/>
	\$ 1,944.80
Subscriptions to CHURCH HISTORY (263) .....	\$ 1,077.28
Sale of copies .....	77.33
Advertising in CHURCH HISTORY .....	75.00
	<hr/>
	1,229.61
	<hr/>
	\$ 3,174.41



*Disbursements*

## Management of Society

Postage and express charges .....	\$	100.32	
Printing and mimeographing .....		150.35	
Stationery and supplies .....		30.10	
Secretarial services			
Secretary and editors .....	\$	40.16	
Treasurer .....		269.00	309.16
Safe deposit box .....		6.00	
Discount on Canadian checks .....		.15	
Traveling expenses .....		99.97	
Bond of Treasurer .....		25.00	
Treasurer's stipend .....		200.00	
			<hr/>
	\$		921.05

## Publication of CHURCH HISTORY

Printing and distribution of magazine .....	\$	2,482.53	
Postage and express charges .....		49.59	
Telegrams and telephone tolls .....		7.18	
Stationery and supplies .....		8.76	
Discount on Canadian checks .....		.30	
Secretarial services .....		47.75	
Refund on Check .....		3.80	
Expenses of editors .....		94.02	
			<hr/>
			\$2,693.93
			<hr/>
			\$3,614.98

## C. STUDIES IN CHURCH HISTORY

*Receipts*

## Sales

Volume III .....	\$	3.25	
Volume IV .....		2.00	
Volume V .....		11.80	
Volume VII .....		19.00	
Volume VIII .....		254.75	
Monograph II .....		6.00	
			<hr/>
			\$296.80
Postage .....		14.46	
			<hr/>
	\$		311.26

## CHURCH HISTORY

*Disbursements*

Volume III						
Settlement with author .....	\$	2.92				
Editorial services .....		.33				
					\$	3.25
Volume IV						
Editorial services .....	\$	.20				
Settlement with author .....		.46				
To Publication Reserve .....		1.34				
						2.00
Volume V						
Editorial services .....	\$	1.18				
To Publication Reserve .....		10.62				
						11.80
Volume VII						
Editorial services .....	\$	1.90				
To Publication Reserve .....		17.10				
						19.00
Volume VIII						
Office expense .....	\$	5.00				
Editorial services .....		24.98				
To Publication Reserve .....		224.77				
						254.75
Monograph II						
Editorial services .....	\$	.60				
Settlement with author .....		5.40				
						6.00
					\$	296.80

## II. COMPARATIVE STATEMENT — OPERATING ACCOUNT

*General Funds and Magazine*

	<i>Receipts</i>					
	1946-47	1947-48	1948-49	1949-50	1950-51	1951-52
General	\$1,418.29	\$1,429.44	\$1,535.06	\$2,003.25	\$2,085.69	\$1,944.80
Magazine	839.63	747.75	706.08	847.26	1,056.01	1,229.61
Totals	\$2,257.92	\$2,177.19	\$2,241.14	\$2,850.51	\$3,141.70	\$3,174.41
	<i>Disbursements</i>					
General	\$ 592.76	\$ 658.35	\$ 779.09	\$ 721.43	\$ 862.96	\$ 921.05
Magazine	1,452.19	1,978.54	1,655.91	1,651.66	1,966.09	2,243.23*
Totals	\$2,044.95	\$2,636.89	\$2,435.00	\$2,373.09	\$2,829.03	\$3,164.28
Operating deficit		459.70	193.86			
Operating surplus	212.97			477.42	312.67	10.13

\*The September 1951 issue of CHURCH HISTORY, paid in 1952, is not included here because it was not an obligation of the fiscal year 1951-52.

## III. ENDOWMENT FUND

## A. CASH

*Receipts*

Brought forward December 1, 1951 .....		\$3,402.44
To Publication Reserve .....	\$ 280.62	
Interest, U. S. bonds .....	267.50	
Interest, Manufacturers' Trust Co. ....	25.29	
Principal, Manufacturers' Trust Co. ....	148.70	
Interest, Western Savings Fund Soc. ....	55.56	
	<hr/>	777.67
Total .....		\$4,180.11

*Disbursements*

400 copies of <i>The Anabaptist View of the Church</i> ...	\$ 475.00	
To Berne Witness Co. ....	\$ 275.00	
To Franklin H. Littell .....	200.00	
Postage for shipment of the 400 copies .....	1.96	
Ira V. Brown, Brewer Prize .....	500.00	
	<hr/>	\$ 976.96
Cash in Western Savings Fund Society .....		\$3,203.15

*Division of Endowment Fund Cash*

Interest on Brewer Prize Fund, \$10,000, 2½% bond .....	\$1,889.06
Publication Reserve .....	1,308.92
General Endowment .....	982.13
	<hr/>
	\$4,180.11

## B. SECURITIES, November 30, 1952

\$ 804.27 guaranteed 1st mortgage certificate, N64, No. 207, of New York Title and Mortgage Company, in liquidation, Manufacturers' Trust Company, trustee.

10,000.00 registered U. S. Savings Bond, Series G,X1066 817G, 2½% 1962

500.00 registered U. S. Savings Bond, Series G,D3382 226G, 2½% 1962

100.00 registered U. S. Savings Bond, Series G,C5711 912G, 2½% 1962

100.00 registered U. S. Savings Bond, Series G,C5711 913G, 2½% 1962

These securities are in the Society's box in the Fidelity-Philadelphia Trust Company, 135 South Broad St., Philadelphia, Pa.

Guy S. Klett,  
Treasurer.



